

HOME RULE

L. G. REDMOND HOWARD

A
0
0
1
2
3
8
:
2
6



THE PEOPLE'S BOOKS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

Incl. 112

HOME RULE

By L. G. REDMOND-HOWARD

AUTHOR OF "JOHN REDMOND: A BIOGRAPHY"

WITH A PREFACE BY

ROBERT HARCOURT, M.P.



LONDON: T. C. & E. C. JACK
67 LONG ACRE, W.C., AND EDINBURGH
NEW YORK: DODGE PUBLISHING CO.

AMERICAN TO VINO
CALIFORNIA SANTA
TERESA

DA
950
R24A

PREFACE

I AM glad, as an Englishman who hopes to do some work for Home Rule, to be allowed to say a word of welcome to a careful and eloquent exposition of the Irish Home Rule case from the pen of an Irishman. Mr. Redmond-Howard is already well known for an able biography of his uncle, Mr. John Redmond. He has seen something of the world abroad: he is studying and working in London, but, like thousands of his fellow-countrymen who have won fame in every quarter of the globe, he does not forget his love for the country which inspires the efforts of her sons, though she is often prevented by her system of government from claiming these endeavours for her own.

We desire a national settlement with Ireland. We are not opposed with argument, because no argument exists. But we are inundated with essays on the ethics of electioneering. We are told that at the last election we obscured the issue. The electorate, we are told, was not aware that when they voted against a Unionist candidate they were voting against the maintenance of the Union.

Well, there are several ways of concealing and obliterating an issue. You may in the first place say little or nothing about it; it may be so "near to your heart" that you cannot bear to discuss it with unsympathetic scoffers in the rude glare of the hustings. Or again, alternatively, you may ostentatiously and with the utmost attainable publicity pluck it from your bosom and cast it from you. You may say, "This *was* an issue, this may be an issue again; but near as it is to my heart, it is, in the opinion of the party agents, lament-

ably far from the hearts of important bodies of voters ; consequently, therefore, having regard to the paramount importance (which no right-minded citizen will dispute) of my winning this election, I declare to you that you may with a clear conscience give me a parliamentary majority, you may make me Prime Minister, and I pledge you my word that I will not inconvenience you by putting into active operation that which hitherto you believed to be my policy."

Both these methods were adopted by the late leader of the Opposition—Tariff Reform was so "near his heart" that it remained for weary months in the deepest recesses of his being, and rarely tempted the coldness of the outer air. But once, at least, it blazed into a beacon-light. "Tariff Reform," said in effect Mr. Balfour at the Albert Hall, in the sore travail of the last election, "is an issue about which I can say one definite thing ; and it is this, that whether you return me or whether you don't, Tariff Reform shall not come into operation until you have had a second knock at it."—"Fight to win and postpone the Food Tax," as in Nov. 1910 *The Observer* blandly headed a letter from a correspondent.

Here then, so far as the Conservative Party are concerned, is an answer to the riddle, "When is an issue not an issue ?"

But they did more than that. The leaders of the Opposition, having with the greatest precision declared that Tariff Reform was not an issue, defined with equal emphasis and unmistakable clarity what the principal issue was. They had disposed of their own positive programme. They therefore appealed for support on the negative ground. If you return us, they said, nothing will happen ; Mr. Balfour has said so. But if you do not return us, they said, do not think that nothing will happen. Home Rule will happen. Mr. Asquith, said Lord Lansdowne, makes it perfectly clear that the first step which will be taken will be to deal with the question of Home Rule.

This, be it observed, is not mere assertion by opponents. It is a deduction, from a perfectly plain

statement, voluntarily made by the Prime Minister, when not a vote had been cast. It is an admission by the leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords that while his party had abandoned Tariff Reform, our party had openly and publicly declared that Home Rule was a principal purpose for which we demanded the Parliament Act, containing indeed provisions of immense importance, but provisions none the less purely mechanical and subservient to subsequent constructive efforts; not a fully manufactured article, but constitutional raw material.

This, I take it, should complete our case. But let us, for purposes of argument, accept the assumption of our opponents. Home Rule, they say, was not an issue, and the Liberal Party have no mandate in favour of Home Rule.

Very well; but if we have no mandate in favour of Home Rule, then clearly they have no mandate *against* Home Rule. How do they maintain that electors who voted Liberal did not vote for Home Rule, while electors who voted Conservative voted against Home Rule? It is a truly delicious example of the favourite Tory watchword, "Heads we win, tails you lose, and elections only count when we get into office."

But apart from the question of tactics, Home Rule in the widest sense is less a principle than a necessity. The Union does not mean unity. It means top-heaviness. It means congestion. It means hæmorrhage of the brain and paralysis of the limbs. The Unionist politician is an Atlas who tries to balance the globe on the end of a walking-stick. Not unnaturally he fails. The British Empire has outgrown the Unionist perambulator. The Colonial Secretary is no longer the nurserymaid who looks to see what the Colonies are doing and tells them they mustn't. Who would exchange Canada at Queen Victoria's accession for Canada of to-day? And yet Laurier and Borden under the old system would have been no less traitors than Papineau and Mackenzie. And if Canada is not most conveniently governed from Downing Street, why is Ireland to be governed from

Dublin Castle, which, if it reflects Irish opinion at all, reflects only the opinion of those Irishmen who despise and vilify Ireland?

We wish for Irishmen a career in Ireland. In what other land do they fail to make their presence felt? The mantle of leadership of the Progressive Party in South Africa has fallen from Sir Starr Jameson upon Sir Thomas Smartt, who, as the *Times* observes in its leading article to-day, is "an Irishman with all the native passion of his countrymen for oratory and affairs." A handsome admission; a pleasing contrast to the customary indictment of national incapacity.

So much for the Irishman abroad. But what alternative is propounded to the brilliant Irishman at home? Exile and success, or failure at his own fireside. An Irishman can be Prime Minister in Africa. No Irishman can be Prime Minister in Ireland. Let him expatriate himself to the honour of England—such is the message of Toryism. But still, in spite of emigration, in spite of famine, in spite of centuries of confiscation, men stay in Ireland, men work for Ireland, that they may have hope for England. Mr. Edward Blake was an Irishman. He was also a Prime Minister—of Ontario. In Ontario he was a British patriot—so the *Times* testified at his death. He pursued a British policy. Then he came to the United Kingdom. But he was no longer a British patriot. Still less was he an English patriot. He was an Irish patriot. He took service as a private soldier in an army where there are no commissions, in a party whose members never take office. He became Nationalist member for South Longford. And yet he was the same man. He was a British patriot in Canada because Canada is free. He was not a British patriot in Ireland because Ireland, governed well or governed ill, is not free. So with Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, a Fenian at home, a wise statesman beloved and respected in Australia. So with many others. Quebec governs Quebec. Canada governs Canada. England governs Ireland. That is the difference that Irishmen will not forget.

We say dogmatically and by experience that the remedy for discontent is responsible government. Responsible government is a system by which the governed constitute, control, and alter the executive which orders their destinies. That is the principle. It is operative in the Empire. It will before long be operative in Ireland. And if I mistake not the temper of the Scottish people and of Scottish representatives, it will be no less operative in Scotland. The application of the principle may differ here and there, but there is no mistake about the kernel of the matter—local patriotism, local parliaments, and around all Imperial freedom and the Union Jack.

ROBERT HARCOURT.

3 CHESTER SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.,
April 11, 1912.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	iii
CHAP. I. THE OLD IRISH PARLIAMENT	11
II. THE CARRYING OF THE UNION	21
III. THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT	28
IV. THE UNIONIST MOVEMENT	38
V. THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECT OF HOME RULE	45
VI. THE ECONOMIC ASPECT OF HOME RULE	53
VII. THE RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF HOME RULE	60
VIII. THE IMPERIAL ASPECT OF HOME RULE	69
IX. THE ULSTER ASPECT OF HOME RULE	76
APPENDIX : THE HOME RULE BILL	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	92
INDEX	94

HOME RULE

CHAPTER I

THE OLD IRISH PARLIAMENT

THERE is probably no better answer to the question, "What would Home Rule be?" than a historical narrative of "What Home Rule was."

It was George Meredith who said that what the Irish question suffered from most in England was the total lack of literature explaining it. It may have been true when he said it; that is, at the beginning of the Parnellite movement; but it could scarcely be asserted to-day, when hardly a month goes by which does not bring forth some first-class work upon the subject.

Still there undoubtedly remain in many quarters traces of that old bigotry which, as Disraeli said, looks upon the "*Union*" as something immutable and in the nature of things, and upon "*Home Rule*" as something "inherently immoral and wicked in itself."

It was certainly not an opinion shared by the great Imperialist himself; much less is it one borne out by history. Indeed, it will be found that quite the contrary is the fact; Home Rule is really the *status quo*, while the Union is something in the nature of an "experiment"; and so like all expedients in legislation, it must be judged according to its antecedents and its consequences.

When men of Professor Dicey's authority and knowledge can describe the movement for Irish autonomy as "a step in the dark," it becomes necessary to go back to the very roots of the controversy in order to show whether it is an "innovation" or whether it

is not, as Nationalists have always maintained, rather in the nature of a "Restoration."

In a word, the question which at the very outset suggests itself is: "What was the exact nature of the old Irish Parliament; what were its scope, its powers, and its history?" We must leave to another chapter the discussion of its merits and its faults; of why and how the "Union" put an end to it.

This point has been very exhaustively treated only just recently by Mr. Swift McNeill, K.C., M.P., who has devoted a little volume to its analysis,¹ in which, without the slightest bitterness, but purely as a lawyer and an economist, he brings out all the salient features of the old constitution under which Ireland was governed.

Quoting Isaac Butt's declaration before the Home Rule Conference of 1873, he writes:—

"From the earliest introduction of the power of the English kings into Ireland, the Irish who submitted to the rule of those kings had a right to the same parliamentary constitution as that which England herself enjoyed.

"The Irish Parliament, like the English, had its hereditary House of Peers. Its House of Commons was elected exactly like the English House of Commons, by the freeholders of the counties, and by cities and towns deriving their right to return members from the Charters of Kings. The freehold franchise was the same in both countries, and the Royal Charters had exactly the same effect and were conferred and tried by the same rules of law."

One naturally asks: "How then comes it that the two countries have not evolved along the same lines of prosperity and do not to-day share the same system of government?" For it must never be forgotten that though under the same Parliament the two countries are governed by diametrically opposite principles: Democracy in England by its native and representative Parliament; Bureaucracy in Ireland under what is called "Castle Rule."

¹ *The Irish Parliament: What it was and what it did.* Cassell and Co., London, 1s.

Mr. McNeill thus explains the difference :—

“While the machinery of legislation was the same, the development of the great principles which lie at the root of the British Constitution was in the two countries widely different. Thus, for instance, the struggle between the prerogative of the Crown and the rights of the people culminated in England in the expulsion of the Stuart dynasty. Ireland was governed for nearly a century after that Revolution on the principles of the Stuarts. In England the constitutional struggle was between the monarch and the Parliament. In Ireland the contest lay between the Irish Parliament and the English Ministry. After the Revolution, the English Ministry, who were themselves dependent on the English Parliament, used the prerogatives wrested by that Parliament from the Stuarts, in the attempt to destroy the independence and enfeeble the powers of the Irish legislature. The aim of the Irish patriot party, in and out of Parliament, on the contrary, was to extend to Ireland the rights gained by England at the Revolution, and thus assimilate the Irish, in spirit as well as in form, to the English Constitution.”¹

In other words, the Irish people in Ireland desired nothing better than to live under the English Constitution; what they resisted, and vigorously, were Castle rule, and the claims of the Scottish and English adventurers who had come over not to uphold that Constitution, but purely to work out their own personal ambitions irrespective of England and Ireland alike. Indeed it may be confidently said that, but for the evils of the *Plantation* system in politics and the *Persecution* system in religion, there would be no Ulster problem to-day any more than there is a Lancashire problem in England.

This is the cardinal fact of Anglo-Irish history, and unless we grasp it, all else is chaos and misunderstanding. Edmund Burke, writing to a prominent member of the Irish House of Commons, thus stated it: What the Revolution of 1688 was to England, that was the Revolution of 1782 to Ireland,² the only essential difference being that whereas “in England it was the struggle of the *great body* of the people for the establishment of

¹ Proceedings of the Home Rule Conference, 1873.

² When the English gave Home Rule to Grattan.

their liberties against the efforts of a very *small faction* who would have oppressed them, in Ireland it was the establishment of the powers of a smaller number at the expense of the civil liberties and properties of the far greater part and at the expense of the political liberties of the whole.”¹

The so-called oratorical extravagances of agitators, to use the historical misnomer, are thus found to have a very concrete constitutional significance. Bureaucracy is foreign to the most elemental instincts of Englishmen, and, if one may use a paradox, a very little historical investigation will show that Home Rule means nothing else but British Rule, in so far at least as that latter term is used in any democratic sense.

Home Rule is British Rule.—Let us see this for ourselves. The first Irish Parliament dates back to a little over a century after the Conquest, and was held in 1295 in the reign of Edward I. The earliest Irish statutes are of 1310. From 1295 to 1495 the Irish Parliament was free from the control of the English Parliament, whose authority was in no way necessary to ratify Irish statutes.

The first innovation, known as “Poynings’ Act,” was passed in 1495. It did not in any way acknowledge the supreme power of the English to legislate for the Irish Parliament, which remained to the days of the Union “co-ordinate,” not “subordinate,” in authority; but it enacted certain provisions which, though, as Mr. McNeill admits, not primarily intended as persecutions, nevertheless, in the abuses they entailed, led to the most disastrous consequences.

Its chief provisions were as follows²: Firstly, that all Acts hitherto passed in England should be binding in Ireland. Secondly, that no Parliament should thereafter be summoned in Ireland unless the Viceroy had obtained the King’s licence to hold it. Thirdly, that the heads of Bills to be introduced in the Irish

¹ *Edmund Burke on Irish Affairs*, edited by M. Arnold, p. 239.

² See *One Hundred Years of Irish History*, by Barry O’Brien, with preface by John Redmond. Isbister, 1902.

Parliament should be first submitted to the English Privy Council. Lastly, that the consent of King and Privy Council should be obtained before such Bills were introduced.

Resistance to this measure is of course at once seized upon by Unionists to show the separatist tendencies of Irish patriots.

Nothing could be further from the truth; and I consider that Mr. Swift McNeill has made no more important contribution to the Home Rule controversy than when he says :—

“The various relations between England and Ireland have been, with one exception, matters of controversy. The nature of the English and Irish Crowns has never been disputed. The various statutes altering the succession of the Crown in England at and after the Revolution were not re-enacted in Ireland. When the English Parliament disposed of the English Crown they disposed likewise of the Irish Crown.”

Then he quotes from many Irish patriots, such as Molyneux, Hood, Burke, Grattan, and O’Connell, to the same effect, that—

“The Irish Parliament admitted the dependence of the Irish on the English Crown; it repelled without qualification the theory of the subordination of the Irish to the English legislature.”

It was all the difference between being loyal to the permanent embodiment of the union of the three kingdoms and the slaves of every passing clique of cabinets; they would be servants of a king, not slaves of ministers.

Thus there was no Act which ever provoked such deep-rooted hostility in Ireland as that entitled “An Act for the better securing the Dependency of Ireland,” passed in 1719, during the reign of George I., in which it was provided that “the King’s Majesty, by and with the consent of the Lords and Commons of Great Britain, hath had and of right ought to have full power and authority to make laws to bind the people and the kingdom of Ireland.”

This was, it was thought, the complement of Poy-
n-

ings' Act. According to Flood (who had made this point "his consideration for twenty years"), and most of the great lawyers of that day, this was the very opposite to its original intention, which had been not to "take away the right of Parliament, but merely to prevent the Governors of Ireland from giving the Royal assent to laws that might be injurious to the King."

Its practical effect was that it made the Constitution of Ireland the very reverse of the Constitution of England: Bills originating not with the House but rather with the minister; in other words, it rendered "the King deaf and the people dumb." Laws, instead of originating, as was the genius of the British Constitution, with the people, originated neither with the people nor with the King, but with the Privy Council, who could interrupt all communications between the King of Ireland and the Irish Parliament.

This at once laid the foundation-stone of a Bureaucracy, which could defy both King and people by placing itself as a wedge between the two.

Thus Grattan, on April 16, 1782, moved an address to the Throne which contained the following passage:—

"To assure His Majesty that His Majesty's Commons in Ireland do most sincerely wish that all Bills which become law in Ireland should receive the approbation of His Majesty under the great seal of Great Britain; but that yet we consider the practice of suppressing our Bills in the Council of Ireland, or altering the same anywhere, to be a just cause of jealousy and contempt."

Several points tended to aggravate the evils of this domination to a still greater extent. The first was the policy of exterminating the natives and confiscating their possessions; the second was the religious persecutions which came in to further complicate the constitutional problem; but this belongs rather to history than to law, and must be treated separately, in order to keep the position of the old Irish Parliament perfectly clear in its "theoretical construction," or, I should rather say, its "practical destruction."

These protests against external interference in purely domestic affairs of the kingdom are to be found at every single period of Irish history ; and they were constitutionally justified, for, as Mrs. J. R. Green observes, with a lawyer's rather than a woman's instinct :—

“Statutes of the English Parliament had not the force of law in Ireland until they had been re-enacted in Ireland ; which indeed was necessary by the very theory of Parliaments, for there were no Irish representatives in the English Houses.”

As early as 1346 Earl Gerald of Desmond headed a kind of Home Rule movement, protesting that Ireland ought not to be governed by “needy men sent over from England without knowledge of Ireland or of its circumstances” ; while about one hundred years later an Earl of Kildare, whose father had married a cousin of Henry VII., protested against the policy of ruthlessly disturbing the fusion of races which had begun in Ireland, exclaiming to Wolsey and the assembled Lords of Westminster : “You hear of a case as it were in a dream, but you feel not the smart that vexeth us.”

The violation of this warning by autocratic changes of faith and confiscation of lands brought its own consequences ; and the power was gradually wrested from the royal hands by Parliament and middle class for their own benefit. As Mrs. J. R. Green ably sums it up : “The idea of a separate royal power and profit (in Ireland) had disappeared, and instead of it had come the rule and profit of the Parliament of England and of her noblemen, ecclesiastics, and traders in general.”

Indeed, strange though it may appear to modern eyes, it was the very loyalty of the Irish which cost them their dearest liberties. The Cromwellian persecutions, for example, with their auctions among gangs of adventurous speculators of lands “to be conquered,” their wholesale massacres and selling of thousands into slavery, were due in their severity to the fidelity of Charles I.'s Irish troops. The allegiance of the Irish Parliament to James II. cost three-fourths of the

nation their civil rights for over a century; William III., in spite of the Treaty of Limerick, which promised Catholics the free exercise of their religion, passing a law excluding Catholics from all parliamentary privileges.

Not only did Parliament become a name, but its very existence was often merely a memory, and the indictment of Grattan against the violation of even this last shred of the Constitution reads more like an indignant novelist's picture of Russian domination in Poland than anything which could possibly have happened under English rule.

The Irish Parliament was not only robbed of its constitution; it was nearly robbed of its very life; for instead of meeting, as in England according to a statute of Edward III., once annually, or oftener, it met about once every generation.

"Of the seventeenth century," runs the astounding philippic of Grattan,¹ "nearly eighty-five years at different intervals passed without a Parliament: from 1585 to 1612, that is twenty-seven years, no Parliament; from 1615 to 1634, nineteen years, no Parliament; from 1648 to 1661, thirteen years, no Parliament; from 1666 to 1692, twenty-six years, no Parliament. Before the Revolution, it thus appears that with the rights and name, Ireland had not the possession of a Parliamentary Constitution; and it will appear that since the Revolution she had no Constitutional Parliament. From 1692 till 1768, nearly seventy years, almost two-thirds of a century, the tenure was during the life of the King."

A series of struggles was necessary to restore the Parliament to what the British Constitution had originally made it, or at least had intended it to be.

Within a century the Irish with their "wonderful assimilative genius" had to a great extent healed the wounds of 1641 and 1688, and united as a nation in protest against the old abuses.

In 1753, Antony Malone, orator and member of Parliament, again brought forth the standard raised by

¹ *Irish Debates*, vol. xiv. p. 84; quoted by Swift McNeill, p. 62.

Molyneux in his *Case for Ireland* in the year 1698, for a free Parliament and a free Constitution ; free trade, free religion, and freedom of person, by the Habeas Corpus Act ; security for judges, and some portion of the government for the native race. The attempt was premature, but it was preparatory. Meanwhile abuses and corruption followed, with their consequent misery. English exports to Ireland sank half a million pounds sterling—almost as much as the pension list.

Then came the War of American Independence. Thirty thousand Irishmen fled over to the new continent, while at home the English Cabinet maintained with sword and gun the astounding British right to tax the colonists against their will, because they had been able to do so in Ireland by the violation of the constitution. It was a lesson in statesmanship which cost England a continent and nearly a kingdom as well.

In 1779 France acknowledged American independence, and thus became the foe of England. An invasion scare which had been gradually growing followed, and when the Mayor of Belfast had appealed in vain for English help to defend the country against invasion, there arose, in the words of Mr. Lecky, "one of those movements of enthusiasm that only occur two or three times in the history of a nation ; the cry 'to arms' passed through all the land, and was responded to by all parties and creeds. They arose to defend their country from the invasion of the foreign army and the encroachments of the alien legislature."

The cry, be it noted, was not hostile to the Empire, although it was as bitter as could be against the Government, or rather misgovernment ; for while demanding legislative independence it asked for military and commercial union.

"On April 19, 1780, Grattan, backed by the volunteers, 40,000 strong, propounded what may be called the Irish Declaration of Rights, which ran, first, that 'the King, with the consent of Parliament of Ireland, was alone competent to enact laws to bind Ireland'; and second, that 'Great Britain and Ireland were indissolubly united under the tie of a common Sovereign.'"

The loss of America in 1782 by Lord North's policy, had taught the ministers some political wisdom, and the King "recommended to the House the consideration of certain matters of importance in order to effect such a final adjustment as would give mutual satisfaction to the kingdoms of England and Ireland." A few months later was granted what I would call the Magna Charta of Home Rulers. It was the statute which was to establish for ever the principle of Home Rule as one of the fundamental laws of the Empire.

It ran as follows :—

"Be it enacted that the right claimed by the people of Ireland to be bound only by the laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of that Kingdom, and to have all actions at law and equity decided in His Majesty's Courts, without appeal thence, shall be and is hereby declared and asserted for ever, and shall at no time hereafter be questioned or questionable."

Ireland was now, in the words of Grattan, a nation. Her aspirations were satisfied, and all she wished was to put her house in order according to her own individual needs and instincts, and make permanent that third fusion of the different races within her shores.

One thing alone was wanting. The Bureaucracy was still all-powerful. There was legislative Home Rule, not executive Home Rule, which would have completed the extension of the British Constitution to Ireland. It was this and this alone which led to the carrying of what is called the "Union," that Act which was not only a moral crime but a diplomatic folly—for, in the words of Mr. Lecky, it united the Parliaments only to separate the peoples.

To make use of Mr. Swift McNeill's admirable summary :—

"Before 1782, the friends of popular rights in Ireland had to cope with the Irish and English Privy Councils, armed with the machinery provided by Poynings' Law for the destruction of constitutional liberty. After 1782 they had to struggle against the influence of an Irish minority who were the agents of the English Cabinet for the bribery of a Parliament unreformed; from its very nature subject to corruption."

CHAPTER II

THE CARRYING OF THE UNION

THE average Englishman is often, with a kind of ethical fatalism peculiar to his race, inclined to believe that the Union "must" have been passed before the failure of Grattan's Parliament "must" have rendered it necessary. Such a judgment is typical of those who attack all technical problems with the *tabula rasa* of plain common sense and think political truths are all self-evident.

How the carrying of the Union became possible still staggers most Irish and English critics. It was due to several deep-rooted evils in the Parliament itself, and these need careful examination, for truth is never, in history at least, the obvious.

In the first place, the differences in the fortunes of the two Parliaments of England and Ireland were greatly affected by the different influence of historical controversies upon them. The continued confiscations of property and the outlawing of Catholics in Ireland made anything like democratic government dangerous to the Government; in England the democratic instincts of Protestantism, on the contrary, made Parliament the best defender of the nation against autocracies like those of the Stuarts.

The principal cause of the difference, however, was that whereas in England the Government was the embodiment of native instincts and native interests, in Ireland the Government was made the legal cloak and excuse for the extravagances of alien exploiters who were continually being foisted upon the nation.

Of the economic and religious effect of such a policy we shall treat in separate chapters; suffice it here to concern ourselves with its constitutional effect.

Beginning with the House of Lords, we find this abuse at once exemplified. Most of the Irish Peers had no connection with Ireland either by property or family, some not even by residence; while most of them, according

to Mr. Lecky, were connected historically with shame rather than with honour. The illegitimate son of a king had far more chance of a peerage than the public benefactor of the nation. Then they could not only vote, but protest by proxy. As to the sale of peerages, it was as notorious, to use Curran's famous phrase, "as the sale of cart-horses in the Castle yard : the publicity was the same : the terms not very different : the horses not warranted sound : the other animals—rotten."

The Peers Spiritual, representing the religion of hardly one-fourth of the natives—the Catholic religion being utterly ignored,¹—by the continued absence of the lay Peers "commanded half the working majority of the Lords," and were almost always half of them English ; certainly every Primate of Ireland, during the eighteenth century, was English. They were the Government pawns ; and the only occasion on which they ever opposed the Government was when it was proposed to mitigate the penal laws in the case of Presbyterians. It was this class of Spiritual Peers whom Swift stigmatised as the highwaymen of Hounslow Heath, who having murdered the original candidates and stolen their letters patent, proceeded to Ireland and were consecrated, in order to follow a safer and more lucrative profession.

The House of Commons, which by the exclusion of Catholics by a law of 1691 could of course only represent at most about one-third of the nation, were equally servile. It had always been a principle, for instance, in the British Constitution, that no person holding an office or place of profit under the King or receiving a pension from the Crown could sit in the English Parliament, though this restriction was occasionally relaxed. In Ireland more than one-half were either placemen or pensioners, so that Flood justly complained that while in England the legislature had only to contend with the native power of Government, in Ireland they had to contend against the mass of another great executive power.

¹ It was a legal maxim, "The law does not presume any such person as a Roman Catholic to exist."

There was also, of course, the great question of election. In most cases there was no attempt at a representative character ; and Grattan, in 1783, urging reform, pointed out this crying abuse.

"Of three hundred members, above two hundred are returned by individuals; from forty to fifty are returned by ten persons; some boroughs have no resident elector at all; some of them only one, and on the whole, two-thirds of the representatives in the House of Commons are returned by less than one hundred persons."

Many of the members, it was even said, could hardly tell the name of their borough or had never been near their constituency.

Again, the Constitution in practice was even worse, if possible, than the Constitution in theory. For the whole Irish administrative and executive was entirely independent of the Parliament.

Theoretically, of course, ministers were open to impeachment, but it only required a simple retirement to England and they were out of the jurisdiction of the Court; and, as Grattan put it, in a country where there was no axe it was impossible to expect good ministers. Nor was this all, for the Irish Judges had no security of tenure, and were all removable at the will of English ministers, a grievance it was one of the first acts of the new Parliament in 1782 to rectify, believing as it should that "Parliament is the true guardian of the integrity of the Bench."

A better example of a perfect Bureaucracy, the very antithesis surely to the spirit underlying the British Constitution, would be hard to find in the history of any country in Europe.

How it was that the "Union" by which "Castle Government" became the permanent form of Government in Ireland, came to be identified with the "Unity" of the two kingdoms is a mystery, and since its tragedy prevents it from becoming one of the world's masterpieces of humour, it must remain as one of the hardest psychological problems of modern politics.

Such was the unreformed Parliament for which Grattan won legislative autonomy, and which he hoped would yet gain executive autonomy !

Possibly the Irish Parliament was not much worse than the English Parliament under Walpole : but this must not blind us to the difference of the circumstances in the two cases. The wonder is not that the Irish Parliament was such, but rather that, being such, it was able, in spite of everything, to gain so many of the benefits of the British Constitution. It had not been, however, without a struggle, and that struggle was not yet ended. For, as Mr. Swift McNeill points out :—

“The general aim of the Irish ministers henceforth was to regain by corruption of Parliament the arbitrary power which England had lost by the Revolution of 1782, while again and again did Grattan complain that the Irish Cabinet was legislating against Ireland to promote its own credit in the Court of Great Britain.”

It was a typical struggle : a corrupt executive seizing the reins of the legislative power in order to establish a permanent “Bureaucracy” independent of all popular electoral control. It was an uneven struggle from the first, but both parties determined that it should be a final one.

The crucial point was reform ; it meant life to the one party, death to the other ; but from the very constitution of the Parliament the odds were terribly on the side of the Bureaucracy.

During its short life, however, the Parliament of Grattan, as few indeed will question, did great work.

It united creeds, it developed industries and fostered residential social life, and strengthened the Empire by its contributions in taxes and men to the wars of Europe ; but in spite of all it was doomed. Henceforth it was not a question of finding a cause, but rather of inventing an occasion for union, and ministers and civil servants and the “rotten borough” members worked hand in hand.

One of the first dangers appeared in 1785 when commercial negotiation for a fiscal union on the basis of free

trade was attempted by Pitt, and accepted by Ireland but refused by Englishmen, who sought to re-establish English commercial supremacy. A "Union" was preached to England as necessary for commercial salvation.

Then came the proposals to "citizenise" the Catholics, the Irish Parliament having given them equal powers to hold property and opened up all the learned professions. This the Bureaucracy resisted, offering the Union instead as an inducement to complete emancipation. As O'Connell thirty years later said, "But for the Union they would have had full and complete emancipation long before 1863,"

Finally came the great appeal for reform, which found an echo in every class save those who, in the words of Burke, had any seats to sell; the "Bureaucracy" found the end was near.

A series of acts was introduced, engineered by a clique of place-holders determined to set themselves in diametrical opposition to all the new democratic instincts of the nation, and range class once more against class, creed against creed, nation against nation.

FitzWilliam's mission of peace was made to fail; FitzGibbon, later Earl of Clare, stirred up violence and organised bribery; men despairing of the Constitution thought of arms; and eager to win back their old immunity the ministers of the Castle determined to treat this resistance to their own misrule as a rebellion against the Crown.

It was in vain General Abercrombie, when sent over in 1787 as Commander-in-Chief, openly declared: "Every crime, every cruelty that could be committed by Cossacks has been committed here, while as to the abuses, they could scarcely be believed or enumerated."

He was promptly dismissed, General Lake brought over, and within a few months the Rebellion had broken out.

That the Rebellion was the spontaneous result of the Grattan Parliament or the direct cause of the Union, no student of history has ever for a moment maintained.

In the first place the volunteers who had created the national movement and had won the Parliament were themselves called into existence to defend Ireland from France, and, as Lord Rosebery once proclaimed, it was one of the chief merits of the Irish Parliament that in time of war it was the staunch ally of the British Empire.

In the second place, it must not be forgotten that the Rebellion was broken by the Irish military forces, and thus paid for out of the Irish Treasury.

On the other hand, the "Ministry" fostered the Rebellion to kill the Parliament. As Mr. Lecky, the Unionist historian, puts it :—

"It cannot, I think, be denied that it is in a high degree probable that a desire to carry a legislative union had a considerable influence in dictating the policy which in fact produced the Rebellion, and that there were politicians who were prepared to pursue that policy even at the risk of a Rebellion, and who were eager to make use of the Rebellion when it broke out for the purpose of accomplishing their design."

The Rebellion once over, ministers at once began to take steps to ensure a union by fair means or foul. It was in vain Grattan protested against the Union: he was talking to men whose votes had long ago been bought; but his words deserve attention.

"The only great capital and fundamental cause of Irish discontent is the interposition of the Parliament of Great Britain in the legislative regulation of Ireland. She feels her Constitution to be her great stake in the Empire, and the Empire the great security of her Constitution. We give our strength to this western barrier for the security of our liberty; but if British ministers should do that very mischief which we apprehend from the foreigner, they take away with that our interest in the British Dominions and thus withdraw at once a great pillar of liberty and Empire. That Constitution has been the inheritance of this country for six hundred years. This Constitution the minister destroys as the condition of our conviction, and he destroys one of the pillars of the British Empire, the habitation of Irish loyalty."

As he assured them in another passage, "The ultimate

consequences of such a union would undoubtedly be separation."

As is the case with every tyranny, it was disguised in the verbiage of a boon; and it has been the policy of those who have benefited by it since, as their ancestors did at the time, to keep up that language. But, for the most part, it has long ago been given up by English statesmen, historians, and jurists.

The Act of Union was purely and simply a panic Act, constructed in violation of every historical precedent and in diametrical opposition to the natural evolution of the British Constitution, and passed by a "Bureaucracy" against the wishes of the whole nation, solely by means of its own abnormal powers and entirely with a view to its own interests.

The words of that great Unionist, Professor Dicey, are familiar to every Home Ruler; but they can never be over-emphasised, and deserve quotation in full:—

"The Union," he writes, "lacked all that element of free consent between independent contracting parties which lies at the basis of every genuine contract. Of the deliberate negotiation, of the calm, satisfactory, business-like haggling for national advantages which marked the negotiations between the Scotch and English Commissioners; of the close consideration of minute details by competent representatives of both countries, there is not a single trace in the negotiations, if negotiations they can be called, between England and Ireland.

"There was plenty of haggling over the details of individual bribes; none over the interests of the country.¹ What were the driving forces? One or two facts are patent—the Irish Protestants were dazed with horror at the massacres of the Rebellion; the Irish Catholics were bullied into acquiescence by promises which were made only to be broken; no appeal was made to the Irish constituencies; and the members of both Houses of Parliament were corrupted. The Act of Union was, in short, an agreement which, could it have been referred to a Court of Law, must have at once been cancelled as a contract hopelessly tainted with fraud and corruption."

¹ Over a million and a quarter—which, strange to say, was borne by the Irish National Debt—was distributed in bribes; Lord Downshire receiving, for example, £52,000; Lord Ely, £45,000; Lord Garrick, £14,000, and so on.

It is often compared to the Union with Scotland. The two were different in every particular. In the first place, as Professor Dicey continues,

"that with Scotland differed in spirit, Scotland being treated as the weaker nation, and getting the best of the bargain. In Ireland the case was far different. After a century of legislation directed expressly against every industry that competed with any English interest, Ireland had in 1782 achieved at once commercial and legislative freedom. In gaining independence, Ireland gained also those very privileges of free participation in over-sea trade which Scotland sacrificed her independence to acquire. The corrupt aristocracy which sold Ireland's freedom, sold also the charter of that right to protect and foster her own industrial life under which the growth of manufacturing industry had been so swift."

The protest against the carrying of the Union, however, is not a mere piece of historical or legal antiquarianism; it has become part of the intellectual life of the nation. The movement along the true lines of the British Constitution as symbolised in a representative Parliament has never ceased; and, indeed, Ireland has never been, in a sense, more English than when she was thoroughly National; never more really Imperial than when she was most earnestly demanding Home Rule.

It is necessary, therefore, to pass on to the analysis of that national life in the persons of the great nationalist leaders.

CHAPTER III

THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

It is said that all history is merely biography; it could be said with equal truth that all politics are but the pronouncements of leaders. Certainly it would be impossible to appreciate the intricacies of the Irish problem without being familiar with the story of the great Irishmen of the last century, filled as their lives were with pathos and heroism and adventures that

make their records often read more like the scenes of a gigantic melodrama than the dull pages of a chronicle.

Parnell once said that Ireland could not afford to spare a single Irishman ; the same could be said of the Irish Movement, which could not be what it is to-day had a single one of those dramatic episodes not been acted. And it is just this feature which gives to all its patriots of whatever rank that singular solidarity and stamps their efforts with that continuity which we call the "Nationalist Movement."

Robert Emmet in 1803, protesting in arms against the moral binding force of a Union that from the first lacked every element of constitutional sanction, belongs to exactly the same movement as Lord Pirrie, protesting against the commercial ruin brought about in the nineteenth century by the running of a kingdom on Bureaucratic lines. Thomas Davis, the poet of Young Ireland, and Sir Horace Plunkett, the agricultural revivalist ; T. W. Russell, the converted Unionist Orangeman ; Lord Dudley, the Home Rule Viceroy ; Patrick Ford, who admired the patriotism of the Fenians ; Lord Dunraven, the landlord advocate of peasant proprietorship ; O'Connell, the agitator ; Parnell, the Irish Tory organiser ; Davitt, the Labour leader ; and Redmond, the Constitutionalist—all these, from their various standpoints, have paid their tribute to "Ireland a Nation," with an inherent right to, and an economic necessity for, self-government.

Against them all, silent and armed, holding aloof from every national gathering, aggressively opposing every democratic reform, and now with threats, now with supplication, striving to keep that ascendant power, taking its politics from the Castle and its religion from Belfast, stands the "Bureaucracy."

Everywhere else the English name has been synonymous with success, freedom, development, Empire, and Democracy ; in Ireland alone has it been associated with failure, harshness, retrogression, sectarianism, and Bureaucracy. And to-day the world is asking why !

It is because Ireland has during the past century never been without a national movement—that is to say, she has never been without her unanimous protest against the “Bureaucracy,” which lives upon her. As long as there is the spirit of cohesion and equality she can never be without a “Nationalist”; as long as there is room for a privileged class, whether in religion or politics, she will never be without a “Unionist.”

At one time the struggle has centred round religion; at another round the land; at others again round education, and round administration—as it is now about a legislature; but always the same ultimate goal has been in view, the restoration to her shores of the British Constitution as represented by a National Parliament. True, the methods have not always been the same: different circumstances called for different tactics, and different classes used different weapons, but still the same “minimum” has been adhered to alike in hard times and in fair.

Every form of repression has been used: anger, indifference, delay, suppression of free speech, imprisonment, death; yet she remains to-day exactly what she was in the days of Owen Roe O’Neill, Grattan and Parnell—a protestant against Bureaucracy.

It is a consistency demanding both respect and attention. A brief survey of the most striking episodes, therefore, though probably familiar to most, is necessary to keep the progress of that movement clearly in view.

We have already seen in the history of her Parliament what was her attitude before the Union; we now turn to her subsequent history.

As soon as the nation awoke to the appalling tragedy which was so irrevocably a *fait accompli*, a species of despair spread through the land. Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Robert Emmet, Wolfe Tone and others were all for physical separation by force of arms.

Rebellions.—Of the objects of these I say nothing; let two Englishmen speak for me.

As to Ireland’s debt of gratitude, let the apologist of English rule in Ireland reply. Speaking of “Separa-

tion " in the seventeenth century, Froude says (*History of England*, vol. x.) :—

"The Irish were not to be blamed if they looked to France or Spain, or any friend on earth or in heaven, to deliver them from a power which had discharged no single duty that rulers owe to subjects."

As to the permanent right to separate, let John Bright answer :—

"I have never maintained," he said (June 3, 1868), "that Irishmen are not at liberty to ask for and, if they could accomplish it, to obtain the repeal of the Union. I say we have no right whatever to insist on a Union between Ireland and Great Britain upon our terms only. I am one of those who admit, as every sensible man must admit, that an Act which the Parliament of the United Kingdom has passed, the Parliament of the United Kingdom can repeal; and further, I am willing to admit that everybody in England allows, with regard to every foreign country, that any nation believing it to be to its interest, has a right both to ask for and to strive for national independence."

Unsettled questions, as Burke said, have no pity for the repose of nations; and in the case of Ireland the national question had not only become reopened by the withdrawing of the Parliament, but any unity and fusion had become impossible through the artificial maintenance of an ascendant and alien minority.

It was a policy virtually provoking separation, for these armed revolts failed; and their only consequence apparently was the making of the executive still more "Unionist and Protestant." As Lord Redesdale, Lord Chancellor in 1802, said :—

"The Catholics must have no more political power and the country must be kept for some time as a garrisoned country: I mean a Protestant garrison."

It was this move which complicated the political problem with religion just as later it was the land problem that gave to the constitutional struggle all its class bitterness.

The first thing that claimed the attention of the

nation was the religious question, which had become acute by the non-fulfilment of the Union pledges of immediate and complete Catholic emancipation. This took close upon thirty years. Not till 1829 did Daniel O'Connell, afterwards called the Liberator, win Catholics the rights of full citizenship and representation. But this did nothing to allay the hostile feeling of the nation, for the Government had only yielded upon the assurance of the Duke of Wellington that it was the only alternative to civil war. Moreover, there still remained the tithe war, which continued for five years, Protestant clergymen collecting tithes in kind, backed by guns and police. And after that, again, there was the further grievance which compelled the vast majority of a people to contribute against the dictates of its conscience to the support of an Established Church it did not believe in.

At the bottom of the religious movement lay yet deeper grievances, for, as T. P. O'Connor observes in his chapter on the fall of O'Connell in *The Parnell Movement*, "O'Connell had calculated that with emancipation he would have been able to wring with promptitude all the other reforms he deemed necessary."

He had helped the Liberals to pass the Reform Bill of 1832, just as his successors have helped the cause of democracy ever since; and he had hoped they would prosecute reforms with energy. He therefore at once started his Repeal Movement; but when at last he put it forward in 1834 as a Bill, he only found his motion laughed out by both sides of the House.

A temporary alliance with the Melbourne Ministry brought some piecemeal relief, such as the opening of municipal offices to Catholics, by which O'Connell became Lord Mayor of Dublin; but the return of the Tories to power in 1841 made him go back to the old policy of agitation which he thought had won emancipation and might win repeal.

The Government, however, poured troops into the country, proclaimed his meetings, and finally imprisoned him. "Instead of the repeal year conducting

to a Parliament in College Green," as John Mitchell put it, "it merely led to a Penitentiary in Richmond."

The gloom of despair seemed to weigh him down, and he was ordered abroad to Italy, where he died (at Genoa) on May 15, 1847, his body being, at his own request, sent back to Dublin and his heart to Rome.

There had been one fatal mistake in the Act of Emancipation, though one that could hardly have been foreseen. The abolition of the forty-shilling freehold test for electors which had previously made it of advantage to the landlord to have as many tenants as possible under him, now rendered such tenants a useless encumbrance—the more so because of the new tendency of legislation which turned Irish land from tillage to pasturage.

One man now sufficed to look after an area it had previously required a village to farm. The industries which the exodus caused by the Union and a hostile tariff had crippled, could not support the population. Before any new land laws could be passed in accordance with the pressure of the Nationalist demand, therefore, huge wholesale clearances began to take place which, added to the famine, hurried everything towards a national catastrophe in which some two millions were literally starved to death.

Meanwhile, as Mr. T. P. O'Connor observes, the country grew daily worse. Hope from parliamentary agitation died in face of a failure so colossal as that of O'Connell, and some of the "Young Irelanders," seized with a divine despair, resolved to try what physical force might bring forth.

Their aim was bold—it was to unite Catholic and Protestant, English and Irish, into a "Nation" once again; for they had long severed themselves from the *Repeal Association*, and openly criticised O'Connell, gathering round the *Nation* newspaper, which became the oracle of a new life. They included such men as Sir Charles (then Mr.) Gavan Duffy, the political writer; Thomas Davis, the poet; John Mitchel, who had adopted the

principles of labour agitation for land, and linked them with repeal; John Blake Dillon (father of the present John Dillon, M.P.), and Smith O'Brien, who afterwards headed the insurrection which in all probability was eventually made rather through "the calls of honour than the chances of success." This attempt, too, was a failure. Most of the leaders, though condemned to death, were subjected to long terms of imprisonment instead.

The new idea then became to create a powerful Catholic official party which would be able to peacefully influence the Government; but this likewise proved a failure in the total subserviency of the leaders of the movement—the notorious Judge Keogh and Sadlier, who eventually committed suicide.

The awful drain of the life-blood of the country during these years before "tenant right" was made a first principle of land laws, and before the Irish party had power to enforce it as such, can hardly be imagined; but some idea may be gained from these figures. From 1849 to 1860 no less than 1,551,000 left the country; from 1861 to 1870, 867,000. Of these 75 per cent. were between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five. Over half a million (1849–1869, 558,050) were compelled to leave by eviction. And this does not include the numbers who died during the famine.

It was this nation-agony which brought forward the Fenian movement of 1850–1867. It found its cradle not so much in Ireland as in America, whither many of the prisoners sentenced with Smith O'Brien had escaped, and where they were met by other kindred hearts. Such were Meagher, Mitchel, Stephens. O'Donovan Rossa, John O'Leary, Terence Bellew McManus, and John O'Mahony. These men banded themselves into what they called the Irish Republican Brotherhood. Their chief organ, *The Irish People*, which appeared in November 1863, openly advocated war, that "heroic counsel of despair," which often reflects far more upon the Government which calls it forth than upon those who take it up.

The Fenians, it is true, failed in their immediate and perhaps impossible object; but they succeeded in showing both the gravity of the suffering and the earnestness of the sufferers. The movement produced men like Davitt, who founded what was called "The Land League." This aimed at the complete destruction of Irish landlordism, not only because the system was responsible for the poverty and depopulation of the country, but because it acted like an English Protestant garrison. Fenianism also roused Parnell from the lethargy of a country squire to the position of the "uncrowned King of Ireland"; while upon Mr. Gladstone's own admission it was Fenianism that first drew his attention to the crying evils which were threatening English domination not only in Ireland, but also in America, where the Fenians were actually heading a campaign into Canada.

The Fenian movement, though undoubtedly national, was never official, and in May, 1870, a new movement reuniting men, classes, and creeds, was started by Isaac Butt, under the auspices of the "Home Government Association" of Ireland. This maintained that "the only real solution was an Irish Parliament for domestic affairs." In the formation of the new party took part men like A. M. Sullivan, Mr. Biggar, and Mr. Richard Power, and after the elections of 1874, 63 out of 103 Irish members were found to be in favour of an entire readjustment of the legislative Union.

Butt may have possessed what Mr. T. P. O'Connor calls "the modest simplicity of real greatness"; the modesty of his real achievement rather suggested "great simplicity." "Year after year, session after session there was the same tale of Irish demands mocked at, denounced with equal vigour by the leaders of both the English parties alike, and then rejected."

From 1871 to 1880 no fewer than twenty-eight land Bills were rejected. Royal Commission after Royal Commission ponderously recorded Parliamentary Omissions, and recommended as great discoveries in London policies which had always been most obvious to every

one in Ireland. But, to save the discourtesy of refusal, the settlement was always deferred to the Greek Kalends.

Was it a wonder therefore if, as some Englishmen say, it takes a hatchet to get a joke into a Scotsman's head, some Irishmen should have thought it necessary to use dynamite to get justice into an Englishman's ?

Something had to be done, and that quickly. Accordingly a new policy was arrived at, more constitutional but not less effective ; a form of "parliamentary dynamite," to wreck all procedure. This was what was afterwards known as "Obstruction"—a policy with which, as a principle, the name of Mr. Biggar is perhaps best associated. It was first made into an active force by Parnell, just then coming to the fore, and gradually ousted the ineffective academics of Butt.

A Tory, a landlord, a man educated entirely in England, and passing through an English University, the new leader was nevertheless as ardent a patriot as any public man since Emmet ; and very soon he found himself at the head of a new party, this time backed by all the united forces of an organised electorate. What with Agitation in Ireland and Obstruction in London, the Irish Question not only came for the first time into the arena of practical politics, but it began to dominate, as it has dominated ever since, all the proceedings of Westminster.

Financed by the sons of the American emigrants of the days of the famine, who in their prosperity had never forgotten the sufferings of those they had left behind, Parnell was able to fight campaign after campaign at the polls, and gather together men of a kindred spirit like Sexton, Dillon, MacCarthy, O'Connor, O'Brien, and Redmond, who have kept up his policy since his death.

The life of Parnell reads more like the melodrama of fiction than the hard facts of history. How at one time angry, at another convinced, the great "Mother of Parliaments" hovered between a policy of coercion,

imprisonment, and suppression of free speech, only finally to inscribe its reluctant convictions with indelible ink in statute after statute; how, accused of complicity with criminal dynamite outrages, which in his own words all but wrecked the cause he had most at heart, Parnell was publicly acquitted by a Royal Commission—all these things are matters familiar to the student of politics.

His chief work is to be found, however, not so much in his actual accomplishment as in the weapon of parliamentary warfare he forged by the creation of the "Independent, pledge-bound party"; and the old principle of "full self-government in domestic affairs," which he restored to the problems of Irish politics.

Of the almost criminal confusion of religion and politics which led to his expulsion from public life upon the publication of the O'Shea divorce case, it is not necessary here to speak; the chaos which followed the "split" among his followers is perhaps the best comment.

For ten years after his death the Irish Question, in spite of the Home Rule Bill of 1893 and the Local Government Act of 1898, was in the wilderness. When, in 1900, John Redmond was elected to succeed the leader to whom he and his little band of Parnellites had always remained faithful, eventually bringing the whole party back to the old policy, Home Rule was—in the words of Mr. Chamberlain—as dead as Queen Anne.

During the twelve years since, many things have happened. The policy of killing Home Rule by kindness has never been very sincere; for even the passing of the Wyndham Act of 1903, which changed the whole land system, was the outcome of a policy of agitation; and when Lord MacDonnell proposed a Catholic university and schemes of reform for the antiquated departments of the Castle, the Unionist Party once more gave way to the Bureaucracy. Since the return of the Liberal Party to power the historic demand has been continually kept in the foreground; and already a

National university has completed the "citizenship" of the great bulk of the Irish people in accordance with Grattan's principles. The Irish Party, however, has for the most part been engaged in fighting the battle of English democracy, and at last, by the destruction of the Veto of the House of Lords, has liberated England from that "Bureaucracy of Class" against which the whole genius of its constitution had been waging war since the days of Magna Charta. To-day the two peoples are about to be re-united under the principles of a common democracy, which can unite under the one Imperial Crown not only two nations, but if necessary a hundred more, without impairing one iota of their internal freedom.

CHAPTER IV

THE "UNIONIST" MOVEMENT

HAVING examined "Home Rule" from the historical and National point of view, we now come to a discussion of it from the purely practical standpoint; for it may often happen that a policy the initiation of which was a violation of some moral principle, can have the most beneficent effects.

That, I take it, is the standpoint of those who, without admitting for a moment that the end has justified the means, are willing to allow the continuing of the effect purely for the sake of its concrete advantages.

The case for Home Rule from this standpoint rests upon even stronger ground than on either theoretical or emotional arguments. The record of a hundred years of "Castle Government" under the "Union" is its own irrefutable condemnation in every single department which can be taken as a criterion of national prosperity.

Take the test of population: emigration has always accompanied ascendancy. Cromwell, for example, transported to the West Indies as slaves no fewer than 40,000; while the Williamite wars cost the country,

according to statistics of the continental military historians, about 450,000 soldiers, who died on European battlefields. Most of these went into voluntary exile with Sarsfield; and as they went to swell the ranks of the enemies of England, it meant a double loss to the United Kingdom.

It is perhaps unfair to bring these into the consideration of the "Union," but it must never be forgotten that the Union was not so much an isolated historical fact as the great instance of a consistent policy which both preceded and followed it. As a matter of fact, the above figures are trifling compared with the "exodus" of the nineteenth century. During the fifteen years preceding the famine, of a total emigration from the United Kingdom of 1,171,485, over 800,000 were from Ireland; during the famine, 1846-1861, this number was increased by 2,500,000.

Again, taking the Parliamentary papers giving the returns from 1851 to 1885 we find the following:—

	Population.	Emigrated.	Percentage.
Leinster	1,439,599	571,393	39
Munster	1,524,138	1,042,018	68
Ulster	1,875,221	899,850	48
Connaught . . .	897,256	427,442	47
County unspecified	110,668	...
Totals .	5,736,214	3,051,361	53

It must not, however, be thought that these emigrations were what emigrations are now.

"Emigrant coffin ships" mean nothing to Englishmen; they meant something hardly less terrible than the Black Hole of Calcutta to Irishmen. They were

veritable hotbeds of fever, as may be understood from the reports of the Chief Secretary. In one year, of 89,738 that embarked, 6100 perished on the voyage, 4100 on their arrival, 5200 in hospital, and 1900 in the towns to which they repaired. Another authority testifies that of 600 on one vessel only 100 survived; while reports in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal* inform us that the *Avon* lost 246 of 552 passengers; the *Virginus* 267 out of 476; the *Larch* 108 in 460.

Had the emigration been purely voluntary, nothing could be said—it was the risk of the Eldorado speculator; but in one-third at least of the cases it was due to deliberate and systematic eviction.

Again, statistics testify to the accuracy of Nationalist oratory. Immediately after the abolition of the forty-shilling freehold qualification the population had, as we have seen, no further political value, and before O'Connell had time to obtain any new land legislation to protect what was known as the “tenants at will,” or as a German put it, *wegjagdbare*—the “hunt-off-ables,” one whole class had been absolutely and irrevocably ruined.

In the six years before 1833, for example, ejectment processes were served against 31,000 defendants, representing probably 155,000 souls. In the ten years, 1841–1861, of the total of 282,545 human dwellings fully one-fifth were deliberately destroyed—a number representing only a half, or perhaps not more than a fourth the number of individuals affected; while from 1849 to 1885 a total of 109,471 families were evicted, representing 558,050 persons.

Even these appalling figures are merely a minimum, for they only represent those against whom the judicial authorities proceeded; and according to Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics* the total should be a full million and a half greater.

The tragedy is still more awful when we remember that in many cases it was owing to no arrears, with no compensation, without any reletting to new tenants; it was purely and simply a clearance of men, without

any prospects of even bare sustenance beyond their farms.

It may be said this was not the fault of the English Government or of the Union. I answer by again reminding the reader that the "Union" was a policy rather than an act. The wholesale destruction of industries, the withdrawal of capital by absentees in England, the absolute indifference to the pressure of Irish representatives at Westminster, the postponement of the radical change declared necessary by both landlord and tenant—these were the natural results of withdrawing domestic affairs from the consultation of local experts in a Home Rule Parliament.

The use not only of a protective but of even a penal tariff against Ireland has always been a part of the "ascendancy" policy; a historical fact even Mr. Balfour himself has admitted. He said, speaking at Alnwick on July 9, 1898 :—

"There was a time, an unhappy time, when the British Parliament thought it was well employed in crushing out Irish manufacture in the interest of the British producer. It was a cruel and it has proved a stupid policy."

William III.'s suppression of the woollen trade is, of course, the stock example, but one has only to read the *History of the Commercial and Financial Relations between England and Ireland from the Period of the Revolution*, to see how the two policies of "ascendancy" and free development affected Ireland's industries.

The testimony of a "Unionist" is most valuable on this point, and Miss Alice E. Murray's important book on the commercial relations of England and Ireland has been justly described by Mr. Redmond as "one of the most remarkable ever written about Ireland."

Speaking of the Irish industrial revival under Grattan she says :—

"The Irish Commons did much to foster new prosperity. They could not spend huge sums of money like England in promoting trades and manufactures, but the sums they did spend

were wisely allotted. The industrial aspect of Ireland rapidly changed. Ruined factories sprang into life, and new ones were built; the old corn-mills, which had ceased working so long, were everywhere busy; the population of the towns began to increase; the standard of living among the artisan class rose; and even the condition of the peasantry changed slightly for the better. Dublin, instead of being sunk in decay, assumed the appearance of a thriving town. In fact, the independent Irish legislature set itself to promote the material prosperity of the country in every possible way, and there is no doubt its efforts had much to say to the really surprising progress which was made from 1780 until the years immediately preceding the Union. The Irish fisheries became the envy and admiration of Great Britain, and agriculture increased rapidly. Various manufactures in Ireland began to thrive; the manufacture of hats, of boots and shoes, of candles and soap, of blankets and carpets, of woollens, of printed cottons and fustians, of cabinets and of glass, all sprang into importance, while the linen manufacture, which had decayed during the American War, quickly revived, and in ten years the exports of various kinds of linen doubled."

On the top of the destruction of industry came the system of "absenteeism," which has been the root of nearly every evil, not only in the country, by handing over the farmer to the middle man, but also in the towns which, deprived of a resident gentry, sank in wealth and significance. This, too, was the direct result of the Union, for whereas in the year previous to Grattan's Parliament the revenue of absentees was estimated at a total rental value of two millions, in the very next year (the Home Rule year) it had fallen one-fourth, and was only £1,608,832, a sum which after the Union immediately rose to £3,000,000 in 1804; increased to £4,000,000 in 1830; to £5,000,000 in 1838; £6,000,000 in 1887, and so on.

It is often said that the Irish Parliament was on the verge of bankruptcy, seeing that from 2½ millions the National Debt rose by 1801 to 28 millions; but this may confidently be put down to Clare's policy of martial law and bribery. The great point to remember is that the 113 millions to which that debt had arisen in 1817 were incurred by England's Napoleonic wars,

and willingly and generously contributed by the Irish to the Imperial exchequer.

In 1817, it was thought necessary to complete the Union of 1800 by a fusion of the two treasuries; for what reasons we may leave to controversialists, but we will assume, in the verbiage of "Bureaucracy," that it was for Ireland's good. We shall pass over the fact that from 1817 to 1870 of two millions raised yearly, one only was spent in government—which means that one-third of Ireland's revenue went for England's wars; and that Gladstone's policy of indiscriminate taxation of the two countries in 1852 added another two and a half millions to her taxation.

We shall judge of the "*Union*" according to its own terms. By its seventh article Ireland had been declared a separate fiscal unit, Castlereagh explaining in 1800 that "Ireland could never be taxed under the Union beyond the measure of her comparative ability, and that the ratio of her contribution must ever correspond to her wealth and prosperity." Under the union of the two exchequers in 1817 she was to have been allowed special exemptions.

Control passed out of her hands, and though she raised the question of the financial relations in 1830, in 1834, and again in 1853, and in the days of Butt, no heed was paid. At last in 1894 a Royal Commission was appointed to look into the matter of the financial relations. It issued its report in 1896, which in substance has been thus analysed:—

1. That Great Britain and Ireland must for the purposes of this inquiry be considered as separate entities.

2. That the Act of Union imposed upon Ireland burdens which as events showed she was unable to bear.

3. That the increase of taxation laid upon Ireland between 1853 and 1860 was not justified by the then existing circumstances.

4. That identity of rates of taxation does not necessarily involve equality of burden.

5. That whilst the actual tax revenue of Ireland is about one-eleventh of that of Great Britain, the relative taxable capacity of Ireland is very much smaller, and is not estimated by any of us as exceeding one-twentieth.¹

¹ *Home Rule*, by Harold Spender, p. 131.

It would be idle to make any comment upon the "Unionist" policy of benevolent altruism to poor old Ireland !

The judgment of Union finance is a sum in arithmetic : Lord MacDonnell estimates the injustice for the century to be £300,000,000.

Take lastly, though perhaps the point is the most important of all, the test of government :—

"The Imperial Parliament," as Mr. Lecky wrote in 1871, "exercises for Ireland legislative functions, but it is almost powerless upon public opinion. It allays no discontent and attracts no affection."

Whatever reforms and reliefs have been passed were obtained only through pressure in Westminster and agitation in Ireland, and the policy has been in the proportion of three or four Coercion Bills to every Concession. From 1829 to 1858, for example, no fewer than twenty-eight land Bills were rejected ; it is this that has cut the very roots of loyalty.

Royal Commissions have been but the registering of Royal Omissions. Their conclusions have been reached in as many years as it would have taken a native Parliament weeks. And even then their decisions have often been mere "Cassandra" warnings. Thus as early as 1843 the Devon Commission had foretold to the Government the liability of some two millions starving, and the necessity of some tenant security ; no notice was taken to prevent the evil which it has required half a century to cure.

"Unionism" as a policy of Government, in fact, stands convicted of nearly every form of economic failure conceivable to the mind of a legislator.

The only great Unionist measures, like the Local Government Act of 1898 and the Wyndham Act of 1903, were those passed in compliance with the Home Rule principle of native advice.

CHAPTER V

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECT OF HOME RULE

WE have seen the history of Home Rule ; we now come to the law of Home Rule : I mean its definition. The real genius of Home Rule has always been to me that it is a policy which makes for unity without forging a chain of slavery, and also allows independence without provoking separation.

It was such a policy as this, which, in the great constitutional struggles that placed Parliament in the position of the king, presented itself to constitutional thinkers as a problem yet to be solved, a species of "Parliamentary Suzerainty," so to speak, to take the place of the old "Royal Suzerainty."

It was not, however, discovered at once. When Pitt declared that he was glad the American colonies had resisted, he was rather administering a rebuke to those who had provoked that rebellion by the violation of the greatest principle of British democracy than really encouraging either disintegration of the Empire or resistance to the Constitution. The attitude of Charles James Fox with regard to the Irish Question was exactly the same. "I would rather," he said (April 16, 1792), "see Ireland totally separated from the Crown than kept in obedience only by force, for unwilling subjects are little better than enemies."

Burke with that world philosophy which, though given to party, was meant for mankind, saw clearer than either Pitt or Grattan, and devised the policy which was eventually to be known as Imperialism ; something which solved the problem of the two rival co-ordinate assemblies under one king, by *proposing to divide not the assemblies, but the subject-matter for their discussion, uniting them only in such matters as affected the welfare of them both*. Writing in 1797, at the most critical period of the controversy, he thus explained the policy :—

"My poor opinion is that the closest connection between

Great Britain and Ireland is essential to the well-being, I had almost said the being, of the two kingdoms.

"For that purpose I humbly conceive that the whole of the superior and what I should call Imperial politics should have its residence here, and that Ireland locally, civilly, and commercially independent ought politically to look up to Great Britain in all matters of peace or of war, and in a word, with her to live and die. At bottom Ireland has no other choice—I mean no other rational choice."¹

In other words, what was needed was legislative co-operation, rather than incorporation.

On another occasion he wrote :—

"I desire to see the connection of the two sister kingdoms reduced to a positive compact, and the manner explicitly defined in which Ireland with the entire and absolute power of local legislation should be bound in questions of peace or war to stand or fall with Great Britain."

As was only to be expected of a "Bureaucracy," they conjured up absolute "Separation" as the only alternative to officialism!

Sheridan, however, one of the leading Whigs in the English Parliament, saw through this device; the real crux lay not between loyalty and disloyalty, but between capability and incapability, honesty and dishonesty, which in the long run meant all the difference between "peace" and "war." He stuck out for what Irish Nationalists to-day stand out for, a business Government. He expressed the whole grievance in one phrase: "The government of Ireland had been made a job for the advantage of English Ministers." In another he proposed the only remedy, advocating for Ireland, "A Parliament uninfluenced by a British Minister, having the happiness of Ireland for its object and looking to Irish prosperity and gratitude for its reward."

Of the fundamental sanity of these proposals it is not necessary to speak here: they passed unheeded; the "Union" became both law and policy.

All arguments, however, as Mr. Kettle says in *The*

¹ *Irish Affairs*, p. 173.

Open Secret in Ireland, lead to Home Rule, and all the years to retribution, so we can only follow the next step in the evolution.

From O'Connell to Butt, as we have seen, there was a continual movement for "Repeal of the Union" as the only means for redress of grievances which, when urged singly in England, were either effectively powerless or fell upon deaf ears.

A Separatist Republican tendency is the outcome of every autocratic impasse, and though reflecting (I think few will disagree with me) every honour on its supporters, it nevertheless tended to prejudice the cause and cloud the constitutional point at issue. Moreover, the terms "Union" and "Unity" had already become identified in that fatal misunderstanding by which British rule became identified in the Irish mind with Bureaucracy; and Democracy in Ireland had been identified in the English mind with Separation. These two facts tended to make any solution which would harmonise the old ideas and the new all the more impossible. Ineffective, therefore, as may have been the career of Isaac Butt in the sphere of practical politics, it must at least be credited to him that he was the first clearly to elaborate a theory of government which would neither reverse the past nor compromise the future.

It was he, in other words, who substituted "Home Rule" for "Repeal," and conceived a scheme of federation in which not only Ireland, but every nation under the British flag would become on equal terms one Empire. True, the discovery might with more technical accuracy be ascribed to Mr. Sharman Crawford, who suggested what was then called "Federalism" as early as 1832. It was even spoken of on the release of O'Connell from prison, as the possible policy of a Whig-Irish alliance, and O'Connell has left a very remarkable letter in which he pointed out its advantages over Home Rule; but it never came into active force as a political weapon, nor was it clearly defined as a theory of government until the days of Butt.

Simple repeal as a remedy would have had two great defects. In the first place, it would have left the Irish executive government still independent of the Irish legislature and the victim of every changing English ministry. In the second place, it would have practically isolated Ireland from the Empire by denying her any opinion on questions of international importance, matters of national defence, and foreign alliances, while representation in the Congressional or Federal Parliament would give her that influence.

The importance of Butt's theory is that, granting all the Englishman meant by "Union," it satisfied all the Irishman wanted by "Separation," and solved what after all is still greatly a battle of words.

His Resolutions passed at the Home Rule Convention of 1873 have ever since formed the basis of every national demand. They ran as follows :—

1. That as the basis of the proceedings of this Conference we declare our conviction that it is essentially necessary to the peace and prosperity of Ireland that the right of domestic legislation on all Irish affairs should be restored to our country.

2. That solemnly reasserting the inalienable right of the Irish people to self-government, we declare the time, in our own opinion, has come when a combined and energetic effort should be made to obtain the restoration of that right.

3. That in accordance with the ancient and constitutional rights of the Irish nation, we claim the privilege of managing our own affairs by a parliament assembled in Ireland and composed of the Sovereign, the Lords, and the Commons of Ireland.

4. That in claiming these rights and privileges of our country we adopt the principle of a federal arrangement which would secure to the Irish Parliament the right of legislating for and regulating all matters relating to the internal affairs of Ireland, while leaving to the Imperial Parliament the power of dealing with all questions affecting the Imperial Crown and Government legislation regarding the Colonies and other dependencies of the Crown, the relation of the Empire with foreign States, and all matters appertaining to the defence and stability of the Empire at large as well as the power of granting and providing the supplies necessary for Imperial purposes.

5. That such an arrangement does not involve any change in

the existing constitution of the Imperial Parliament or any interference with the prerogative of the Crown or disturbance of the principles of the Constitution.

6. That to secure to the Irish people the advantages of Constitutional Government it is essential that there should be in Ireland an administration for Irish affairs, controlled according to constitutional principles by the Irish Parliament and conducted by members constitutionally responsible to that Parliament.

7. That in the opinion of this Conference a Federal arrangement based on these principles would consolidate the strength of the Empire and add to the dignity and power of the Imperial Crown.

8. That while we believe that in an Irish Parliament the rights and liberties of all classes of our countrymen would find their best and surest protection, we are willing that there should be incorporated in the Federal Constitution articles supplying the amplest guarantees that no change shall be made by that Parliament in the present settlement of property in Ireland, and that no legislation should be adopted to establish any religious ascendancy in Ireland, or to subject any person to disabilities on account of his religious opinion.

The true greatness of the principles underlying these proposals was that they embodied the demand for which both parties had been contending—the English demand that the affairs of Ireland should be “subordinate”; the Irish demand that they should be “separate.” They proposed, in fact, to restore the Parliament without repealing the Union.

Gladstone's Home Rule Bill of 1886, to a great extent, embodied these suggestions. It proposed an Irish executive subordinate to an Irish Parliament and the Crown. Peace or war, the Army and Navy, Militia, Volunteers, Defence, &c., foreign and colonial relations, dignities, titles of honour, treason, trade, post-office, and coinage, also any laws referring to endowment of religion, restraint of educational freedom or relating to customs or excise were to be excluded from the powers of the subordinate Parliament.

As to police and constabulary, these were eventually to be handed over to the Irish Parliament. Ireland's contribution to Imperial revenue was to be one-fifteenth. Any questions that arose about the powers of the Irish

Parliament were to be submitted to Judicial Committees of the English Privy Council. But where the Bill failed was in the proposal by which the Irish members were to be excluded from the Imperial Parliament—an arrangement which would only re-establish the old difficulties over again.

This, however, was a deficiency which was rectified in the Bill of 1893; though another difficulty arose in determining in what subjects the Irish members were to be allowed to take part in the Imperial Parliament.

The fate of these two measures—the former being rejected in the Commons in 1886, the latter in the Lords in 1893—does not affect their constitutional merits. What is noteworthy is that neither of them was rejected for anything intrinsic to its principles, but for purely extrinsic or opportunist reasons.

The first was the anti-Catholic scare, the second the anti-landlord scare, and the third the anti-English scare. The times may have lent a certain colour of probability to these dangers. To-day they are no more, and the question is being approached by most intelligent men, as it should always have been approached, from the purely business and constitutional standpoint.

Home Rule to-day,¹ therefore, stands upon an entirely different footing; it is no longer a question of patriotic rights, but of sheer business necessity. Home Rule does not mean the establishing of a rival legislature, it means the decentralisation of the same legislature; and all delegation of authority is the strengthening of the central power.

The effect of Home Rule upon the Parliament at Westminster would be felt in two ways; it would free the Irish Party on all “non-Irish” affairs, and it would free the English parties from “purely Irish affairs”—in a word, Home Rule for Ireland would mean Home Rule for England.

At the present moment, as often before, the Irish Party absolutely dominate the English Parliament. But if it is argued that they represent an alien

¹ See Appendix.

interest, then their chief contention is granted, for the English domination in Ireland is likewise proclaimed an alien influence. If, on the other hand, Irish members are forced to take a part on terms of absolute equality, then they must be allowed full liberty to take advantage of the weapon "Unionists" have placed within their hands.

As a matter of fact, it is injurious to both interests. Thus Mr. Stephen Gwynn, M.P., in an article called "Why Home Rule is needed for Ireland and for England," wrote as follows :—

"The most obvious and immediate advantage of Home Rule would be in the working of Parliament. There would be a saving of parliamentary time amounting to some weeks in every session, yet the real benefit reaches far deeper. The Irish Party exists for one purpose—to secure Home Rule. All its action is governed by this consideration ; it has no care for the efficiency and dignity of the Assembly."

"The presence of such an alien element must necessarily be demoralising. But the mischief is more positive. Matters of the utmost moment to England or to the Empire may be decided not on Parliament's true judgment of their merits, but according to the Irish Party's estimate of another interest. The more important the question, the more likely this is to be the case. The Irish vote on Free Trade or Tariff Reform is given without the least examination of that great controversy. The growth of a third English Party makes it increasingly probable that the Irish will, while the Union lasts, hold the balance of power with growing frequency. If Home Rule were granted, the number of Irish representatives retained in Westminster would be reduced in proportion to the population, and those who were retained would divide themselves on normal party lines."

Some form of decentralisation is necessary at once ; and Lord Dunraven has admirably expressed it in his *Legacy of Past Years*. He writes :—

"Devolution is necessary for Ireland and for Great Britain. It is necessary in order to restore efficiency to Parliament. Parliament must be purged if the Democracy is to rule. We are drifting, if we have not already drifted, into a bureaucratic

system partially controlled by an oligarchy. By a large delegation of power departments have been placed beyond Parliamentary control. From the indecent and fraudulent tumult of an election a number of individuals emerge, the majority of whom, however closely compacted, proceed to delegate all authority to a small committee who become ministers of the Crown. They control administration and, so far as the House of Commons is concerned, legislation also. They allow or forbid, lengthen or shorten debates as they will. For any practical good that he can do, the private member has ceased to exist. The representatives of the people have become a sort of electoral college for the creation of a Cabinet, an oligarchy masquerading as a democracy rule; representative government and Parliamentary institutions are becoming a sham."

There is too much delegation up—i.e. the Unionist principle of Bureaucracy; too little delegation down, the Home Rule principle of Democracy.

I will conclude the constitutional aspect of Home Rule by one further quotation from Mr. Pringle, M.P., pleading the Home Rule principle from the point of view of the private member:—

"Apart altogether," he writes, "from the Irish demand, the problem of Home Rule or decentralisation was bound to have been forced upon British statesmen, owing to the growing difficulty of the Imperial Parliament discharging efficiently the increasingly multifarious duties laid upon it. **Every year millions are voted without a word of discussion, and the services to which the money is applied are free from all parliamentary supervision.** The evil grows apace. In 1903 the sum approximately voted under closure was £3,718,380, but it increased steadily every year, until in 1910 it reached the startling total of £52,236,081!

"*Matters of merely local interest absorb an undue share of Parliamentary time, and Imperial concerns are often neglected.* It is calculated that during the last ten years 40 per cent. of the Bills passed were of purely local application.

"**In former days unofficial members could initiate and pass much useful legislation; now their opportunities are almost eliminated.** From 1900 to 1910 inclusive, out of 3175 Bills introduced by unofficial members, 2001 had to be abandoned; and of those which were passed nearly all were non-contentious."

CHAPTER VI

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT OF HOME RULE

THERE is a great tendency at the present day to look at everything from what is called the business point of view ; and the attempt has been made to distinguish in Ireland the politician from the commercial man, as if Home Rule had no economic significance. As a matter of fact, if Home Rule is passed at all, it will be purely and simply because it is a straightforward business proposition.

Many seem to be unaware that there already exists in Ireland a form of miniature Home Rule—self-government actually in being and a commercial success. Such is the case of the Irish County Councils which were established in 1898, and gave Home Rule to rural and urban districts in Ireland. Between local and national self-government in domestic affairs is only a difference of degree, not of kind. All the reasons now urged against the larger measure were urged against the smaller measure—intolerance, incompetence, and extravagance. Lord Salisbury even went so far as to say that it would be worse than Home Rule.

It may not be beyond the point, therefore, to judge of the economic aspect of Home Rule from the working of the County Councils.

Let us first be clear about the principle that was at stake in their creation.

As Mr. John Redmond, speaking at Ennison, November 17, 1907, said :—

“ It was not a half measure. It was not a half-way house ; it conferred full and complete control, as fully and completely as was conferred on the English people and on the Scottish people ; full control of local affairs, on the mass of the Irish people. It worked a social revolution ; it completely disestablished the old ascendancy class from its position of power, and made the mass of the Irish people masters of all the finance and all the local affairs of Ireland. It placed an enormous patronage in the hands of the people ; it gave them control of the expenditure of

vast sums of money—in a word, a more thorough test of the capability of the mass of the Irish people to govern themselves could not have been devised.”

In no matters, to use the words of the 1902 Report, have the Councils been more successful than in their financial administration, for since the establishment of Local Government they have managed to pull down the average total county rates for the whole country by as much as threepence in the pound, and this while during the same period there was an increase of over 10 per cent. in Imperial taxation. Of the religious tolerance we will speak separately; but the business or economic point of view seems sufficiently vindicated in these tributes.

Now, the economic results of Home Rule would be upon a large scale—that is, applied to all the great departments of Irish administration—what the effect of County Council rule is in minor spheres. The average Englishman would probably answer with the smile of incredulity were he told that Ireland possessed at once the most expensive and the worst form of government in Europe; but were he to take the trouble to investigate the matter for himself he would undoubtedly find that this is so.

Let this not be taken on “Nationalist” authority, but let us get good “Unionist” witnesses! Say Mr. Chamberlain to begin with; and I may remark I know of no stronger denunciation of that Unionist policy which, as Lord MacDonnell, the veteran Indian administrator, said, “If applied to any of our colonies would drive them into open rebellion in a year,” than is contained in the following passage. True, Mr. Chamberlain has changed his views on the remedy, but save in only a very few details, such as the County Councils, the facts remain what they were in 1885.

He said at West Islington, on June 17 of that year:—

“The pacification of Ireland at this moment does, I believe, depend upon the concession to Ireland of the right to govern

itself in the matter of its purely domestic business. Now what is the alternative? Are you content, after eighty years of failure, to renew once more the dreary experience of repressive legislation? Is it not discreditable to us that even now it is only by unconstitutional means that we are able to secure peace and order in one portion of Her Majesty's dominions? I do not believe that the great majority of Englishmen have the slightest conception of the system under which this free nation attempts to rule a sister country. It is a system which is founded on the bayonets of 30,000 soldiers encamped permanently as in a hostile country. It is a system as completely centralised and bureaucratic as that with which Russia governs Poland, or as that which was common in Venice under Austrian rule. An Irishman at this moment cannot move a step, he cannot lift a finger in any parochial, municipal, or educational work without being confronted, interfered with, controlled by an English official appointed by a foreign Government, and without the shadow or shade of representable authority. I say the time has come to reform altogether the absurd and irritating anachronism which is known as Dublin Castle, to sweep away altogether these alien boards of foreign officials, and to substitute for them a genuine Irish Administration for purely Irish business."

It was just this system which Nationalists for a moment hoped would be changed by Lord MacDonnell, when Wyndham was Chief Secretary for Ireland. For even then the facts were still unchanged materially since the days of Gladstone.

Once more the cry of danger to the Empire was raised by the Bureaucracy as it skilfully hid itself behind the "Union" Jack, and a short time later Mr. Balfour publicly denied that the scheme of reform proposed by the "Devolutionists" was in any way intended to substitute "Castle Boards" by representative government. "You might as well," he said, "have accused the Government of horse-stealing."

That it was a reform badly needed, however, was commonly admitted, and in the controversies that ensued Lord Lansdowne was one of the most ardent defenders of Lord MacDonnell.

"Anybody who has studied the question," he said in the

House of Lords, "is aware that there is room for considerable improvement in the complicated, old-fashioned organisation."

And he maintained that in endeavouring to break down the barrier which has too often divided Dublin Castle from the rest of the country, he had taken a step in the right direction.

Home Rule, therefore, is not a revolt against the authority of the Imperial Parliament, which would remain in all Imperial affairs as strong, if not stronger than ever; it is a revolt against Dublin Castle, whose reign it would absolutely end.

"It is difficult to describe what is commonly called Castle Government," writes Lord Dunraven in his *Outlook in Ireland*; "it is easier to say what it is not than what it is. It is not a democratic form of government, for the people have nothing to say to it; either through some representative machinery in Dublin or through their representatives in Westminster. It is not despotism, because the Lord-Lieutenant has very little power. It is not exactly an oligarchy, though a small but avaricious section of the community appear to think that the country should be run for their benefit alone. It is a sort, and a very bad sort, of bureaucracy—a government by departments in Ireland, uncontrolled by Parliament, and subject only to a department in London. It is the most expensive system of government in the world. Head for head the government of Ireland costs more than the government of any civilised community on the whole face of the world; under it there is no security whatever against absolute waste and misapplication of money—no security against the indirect extravagance that arises from money not being spent in the best direction or in the wisest way."

Ireland is admittedly poorer than Scotland, for example. Yet according to a Treasury statement, November 2, 1911, civil government costs (Customs, Excise, and Post Office services) in England 29s. 2d., in Scotland 33s. 4d., in Ireland 51s. 9d. per head. Police in England costs 3s. 4½d., in Scotland 2s. 5½d., in Ireland 6s. 8d. per head. Nor is this all. The cost of "Irish services defrayed out of Imperial funds" rose in ten years (1895 to 1905) from £5,939,000 to £7,635,500; so that it is the English as well as the Irish taxpayer who

pays these officials for misgovernment—in other words, it is “Castle Government” not “Home Rule” which is “on the rates.”

Take again the number of Government officials assessed for income tax. Though Scotland is more populated than Ireland, there are only 963 with salaries over £160, totalling £320,764; in Ireland there are 4403 with salaries totalling £1,448,066. England, of her 1800 millions revenue, spends $\frac{1}{40}$ th on home government; Ireland of her 70 millions national revenue, $\frac{1}{10}$ th.

Some Irish departments and offices employ whole regiments of officials, who have handed over to them seven and a half millions for government of the country. This goes unchecked and unchallenged, as far as any Irish authority is concerned, and as to any English authority as well—for they are rushed through in the three days a year allotted to Irish Estimates at Westminster.

Now let us judge Ireland from a standard outside the United Kingdom. Perhaps this will be the best answer to those who maintain that, “economically,” Ireland would be unable to support herself because of her poverty :—

“If one looks at the case of Denmark,” writes Mr. J. F. MacDonnell in his excellent book, *Ireland and the Home Rule Movement*, “one finds a rich agricultural country with a population of six and a half millions, which is able to maintain her home and foreign government, a Royal Family, a debt, an army with a war strength of 70,000, a fleet, and the expenditure of three colonies on an expenditure of only **four and a half millions**. Sweden, with a population of six and a half millions, a large commerce and many industries, is able to support her whole Government, Army, Navy, diplomacy, and civil service on a budget of little more than five millions! The cost of Civil Government in Belgium with a greater population and four times the trade is one-half that of Ireland.”

It is such facts as these which bring home the real economic value of self-government in domestic affairs. Home Rule means business rule.

Take only one or two examples from among the

thousand cases which call for immediate treatment, like the railway, the poor law, afforestation, reclaiming of waste lands, developing of industries, spread of education, and so on, which, recommended by Royal Commissions over and over again, cannot, because of lack of time, have the attention of legislators at Westminster, and are debarred from settlement in Dublin by the terms of the Union. Each of these departments contains anomalies which only the "men on the spot" can fully appreciate, and therefore only the "men on the spot" can rectify; and expert government needs local government.

It is in these economic concerns that delegation becomes not only a legislative but a scientific necessity. Suppose, for example, in accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commission, the Irish railway system should be nationalised. This system is one of the curiosities of civilisation, with its thirty companies, managed by 130 directors, and all together only owning 3000 miles—i.e. one company for every 100 miles, and one director for (roughly) every twenty-five!

A Royal Commission has suggested State control, but years may elapse before Parliament has time to consider the matter, and even then it would mean confiding a very technical concern to a set of men wholly, not only indifferent, but ignorant of its bearing on the national life. Imagine managing the Canadian-Pacific Railway from Downing Street!

Meanwhile, commercial strangulation is proceeding. Take a few examples. Whereas it costs 16s. 8d. to get a ton of eggs from Normandy to London, and 24s. from Denmark, it costs 94s. from Galway. Comparing this with another great market of England, Canada, it is found that while farm produce there pays in carriage 3 per cent. of its value, in Ireland it is carried at a rate of 15 per cent., or even 20 per cent. And this when, according to Board of Trade figures, labour costs respectively 19s. 7d. in Scotland, 18s. 4d. in England, and in Ireland 11s. 3d.; to say nothing of the yearly casual labour

emigration from Ireland, which is estimated at several thousands.

The economic significance of such figures is this : that in an area of production where labour is cheapest the rates of carriage are most expensive, and there is no remedy by any public authority.

It is no argument to say that a "Unionist or a Liberal Government might settle it"; the old principle that "there is only one person who can tell where the shoe pinches" has first to be proved a fallacy. The complicated interdependence of all Irish domestic concerns can be realised only by the farmers and business men. It is for these the politicians have been pleading since the Union, and once they have obtained this liberty of internal government and development, "oratory," pure and simple, can sing its "Nunc Dimittis."

Nor is this to the disadvantage of England. Englishmen often talk of a self-sufficient Empire which could in time of war, either military or commercial, keep the population of London from starvation. But are they aware that in doing so they are using the very strongest Home Rule argument that was ever forged? Here at the very door of the most densely populated city in the world lies a field of production which, with its natural resources properly managed, could be made one of the most fruitful and the least expensive in the Empire!

It is absolutely idle to say that there is an insuperable objection to the gathering of Catholics and Protestants into one commercial and administrative chamber because of the inherited religious animosities of the two parties. I defy Sir Edward Carson himself to raise a theological controversy about an egg. The Ulstermen of the North might make the canal system more "methodical,"—they could hardly make it "methodist," and I have never heard of farmers of the most Catholic counties breeding a single "Papal Bull."

The fact is the new Parliament will probably be what Miss Murray tells us the old Parliament of Grattan was in the past: "Nervously anxious not to lose English

custom and preferring to accept commercial inequality rather than provoke England to retaliation." This economic tendency of the Irish mind is one of the most striking developments of nationalism since the Parnell movement.

CHAPTER VII

THE RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF HOME RULE

It is probably no exaggeration to say, in the words of *The Catholic Times*, that the Irish problem has always been at root a religious question, for the well-known party cry that Home Rule means Rome Rule, however false in itself, is at least a testimony to its import in the general controversy.

It would be most unjust to judge of the religious differences of our ancestors by modern standards of religious and political toleration; but it would be hardly more unjust than an attempt to understand the controversies between Catholic and Protestant in Ireland without any reference to the historical antecedents which have produced them. In other words, one cannot entirely rely upon the statistics turned out by either party in support of toleration or of persecution.

Although it was nearly a hundred years before St. Augustine reached England that St. Patrick had evangelised Ireland and sown the missionary seed which later brought forth a plant whose branches spread over the whole of Northern Europe, the Celts of Erin as a whole had evidently suffered from the Danish incursions by the time of the Normans. For in the Bull of Hadrian IV. by which Henry II. was authorised to conquer Ireland, it was specially mentioned that the invasion was strictly to be—

"in the proper spirit of a Catholic Prince for the purpose of widening the boundaries of the Church and explaining the true Christian faith to those ignorant and uncivilised tribes in Ireland, and likewise exterminating the nurseries of vice from the Lord's dominions."

The authenticity of the Bull has been questioned; but its undoubted influence on the minds of that and subsequent ages makes that point one of very little relative importance. Its effective result was the supposed investment of English sovereigns with temporal authority over Ireland, and in consequence of acceptance, was a submission of the temporal to the spiritual authority.

It undoubtedly bore the political and the spiritual stamp of its author, a Pope and an Englishman, whatever authenticity or validity is ascribed to it; and it had a most disastrous influence upon the subsequent history of politics and religion in Ireland.

One can only speak of the English conquest of Ireland before the reign of Elizabeth as one can speak of the Conquest of America by Columbus; but the relevance of this to the religious question does not appear until the days of the Reformation.

To all intents and purposes the inhabitants of Ireland had become fused in one creed, and that creed, as in the rest of Christendom, was Catholic. What the results of Henry VIII.'s policy of confiscation of the lands of the Irish chieftains would have been with the later complications of religion may be an interesting subject for speculation; so may the question as to what root the new ideas raised by the Renaissance and the Reform would have taken in a land of culture such as Ireland was under her own laws, art, and literature. One thing only is certain, that the policy of Cardinal Allan and the Courts of Rome and Madrid, which proposed reconquering England by force of arms rather than strength of conviction, was fatal to Ireland.

The Armada had been originally intended to rescue Mary, Queen of Scots, and in an interesting correspondence it is shown how the English Cardinal, well knowing his countrymen, warned the invaders that if they once appeared in English waters as supporters of a foreign rather than an English sovereign, they might give up their cause as lost. The Scottish Queen, however, was not given the opportunity of such a championship by her

English rival ; and the Spanish hosts, instead of coming to re-establish a native Catholic throne, appeared to try to plant a foreign domination.

There is still a record of a little band of Catholics in England vainly protesting against this suicidal policy ; but they were overruled in the intrigues that ensued, and henceforth in the United Kingdom the whole Biblical controversy of the sixteenth century was changed from a quarrel of theologians to a war of kings, nations, and dynasties.

This must be thoroughly appreciated as a fact, however much to be deplored or however much it may be justified, for it is the key to the whole complications that followed. Arguments ceased the moment war began, and in consequence the laws of war took the place of the laws of thought.

It may be doubted whether the little group of English Catholics have not been justified by time in their protest against the Armada being employed to enforce Catholicism upon England at the point of the sword ; certain it is that in the English mind Rome has ever since been identified with a centre of political power rather than a source of theological thought.

England was the minority as compared with France and Spain, which Ireland was with regard to Great Britain ; and, as with all minorities, self-defence was not unnaturally looked upon by both as the first law of existence.

It was to be a fight to the finish. Pius V. had himself launched the ultimatum :

“ We do declare her (Queen Elizabeth) to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland ; and also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, all others which have in any sworn to her to be for ever absolved from any such an oath.”

The answer of the English Government was equally sweeping ; and there was enacted such a code of penal legislation as probably can find no religious parallel

outside Spain, and no political parallel outside Russia. It was virtually indeed, as one English writer put it, a "Mahomedan conquest." The Catholic was to be, if possible, exterminated, if not, at least outlawed.

During the Stuart and Cromwellian period the policy was that of actual annihilation,—"extermination preached for Gospel."

"The favourite object of the Irish Governors and the English Parliament," says Leland, the Protestant historian, "was the utter extermination of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland; their estates were already marked out and allotted to their conquerors, so that they and their posterity were consigned to inevitable ruin" (Book V., chap. iv.).

In spite of this, however, eminent Protestant historians are wonderfully unanimous in declaring the remarkable spirit of toleration showed by Irish Catholics when in power, as in the days of Mary and James II. They include such names as Buckle, Hallam, Laing, Lecky, Sydney Smith, Taylor, &c.

From William on, the policy was one of outlawry or penal laws; the terrible nature of which it may not be without utility to remind the present generation. Lord Dunraven writes, in his *Legacy of Past Years*, p. 129 :—

"The Penal Code came into existence under William, immediately after the Revolution, and was extended under Anne and the first two Georges. It affected all human action and endeavour in every form of life. Catholics were prohibited from sitting in Parliament, and were deprived of the Franchise. They were excluded from the Army, Navy, the Magistracy, the Bar, the Bench. They could not sit on Grand Juries or Vestries, or act as sheriffs or solicitors. The possession of arms was forbidden to them. They could not be freemen of any corporate body, and were allowed to carry on trade only on payment of various impositions. They could not buy land nor receive it as a gift from Protestants; nor hold life annuities or mortgages or leases for more than thirty-one years, or any lease if the profit exceeded one-third of the rent. Catholics were deprived of liberty to leave property in land by will. Their estates were

divided among all their sons unless the eldest became a Protestant, in which case the whole estate devolved upon him. Any Protestant who informed upon a Catholic for purchasing land became the proprietor of the estate. No Catholic was allowed to possess a horse of greater value than £5, and any Protestant could take the horse for that sum. A Protestant woman landowner was, if she married a Catholic, deprived of her property; mixed marriages celebrated by a Catholic priest were declared null. A wife or a child professing Protestantism was at once taken from under the Catholic husband or father's control, and the Chancellor made an assignment of income to them. Catholic children under age at the time of the Catholic father's death were placed under the guardianship of Protestants; Catholics were excluded from seats of learning. They could not keep schools or teach or act as guardians of children."

Such an appalling enumeration needs no comment, either on the ferocity of the powerful or the heroism of the victim. Throughout the struggle which has now continued for over three centuries, and of which Home Rule is the last phase, the cries of the oppressed majority and the dominant minority have been exactly as they were in the beginning.

The Catholics have claimed the rights of equal citizenship irrespective of their religious convictions; the Protestants have stoutly resisted any attempt to place them on an absolute equality because of those convictions, so that every religious question has remained a political one, and every political, a religious.

It would be partisan to assume that either party was less sincere than the other in its religious beliefs; equally so to judge of one in the terms of the other; one can only weigh them respectively in the common balance of science and democracy.

Each generation has handed its own traditions on to the next, and these, often sanctified by the blood of a martyred ancestry, still divide the two parties, and to change is judged a crime worse than apostasy. The consequence is that while all over Europe toleration and mutual understanding have progressed, in Ireland in the nineteenth century—nay, even in the twentieth

century—there still exists a religious rancour little more enlightened than at the time of the Reformation, when the sword first attacked problems which the pen alone can conquer. This state of things I do not attribute entirely to the “Union” but to the policy of “Unionism” which has interfered artificially with the natural growth of the national mind.

For I maintain that, whether from an atheistic or from a Christian standpoint, there is nothing more disastrous either to science or morality than the confusion of citizenship and religion; and if proof were needed, no better example could be given than the present conditions of the theological camps in Ireland.

The great religious controversies raised throughout Europe by the sixteenth-century criticism are as far from solution to-day in Ireland as they were in the days of the fires of Tyburn and the tortures of Torquemada. Every religious war was a further postponement of their solution; each persecution only added a new endearment, and each new endearment to the heart is but a new obstacle to the mind, for these problems were ever and must always remain problems to be “thought out” rather than “fought out.”

That *entente cordiale* of the University lecture-room which gave to English theology intellectual Home Rule, in the days of Newman and Pusey, during the thirty years of the Oxford Movement, did far more towards a permanent settlement than the three centuries of penal legislation; and both creed and citizenship are the richer for it. In England thousands have changed camps; in Ireland there are no converts, and wherever freedom of selection is absent, sincerity in retention is often lacking also.

This “Unionist” principle of State patronage of one religious belief not only ends generally in producing the opposite effect to that desired, as in the case of High Church intolerance producing Nonconformity, but it is an evil both in itself and in its results.

It is an evil in itself because it gives orthodoxy merely a utilitarian value; it is an evil in its results because it

has always been, as in the days of Charles V., disruptive of Empire and destructive of national life, and if continued in Ireland could only end in making Catholicism the religious form of Anglophobia and Protestantism the cloak for Bureaucracy.

Home Rule, on the contrary, would place the existing party quarrels upon their proper respective planes; the "Religions" having to justify their claims to individual intellects by the inherent weight of their own scientific apologetics in the Universities, and "Bureaucratic and Democratic" theories having likewise to justify the claims to acceptance in the political system by the utility, which their respective exponents could prove for them, in the Deliberative Assembly in Dublin. For in freedom is both peace and truth.

That Home Rule would produce exactly those evils which it was intended to rectify I do not for one moment admit; in the first place because religious intolerance is not a trait of the Irish Nationalist character, and secondly because any attempt to make Home Rule Rome Rule would destroy its own ends.

Before proving this, I might here remind English readers that if ever it was the policy of any English Party to establish Rome Rule in Ireland, it has certainly not been the Liberal but the Conservative policy.

The promise of "Rome Rule" in the shape of Catholic Emancipation was one of Pitt's strongest inducements to the "Union." In 1814 Catholic Unionists secured a letter from Pius VII. advocating the Royal Veto on Ecclesiastical appointments in Ireland, but it came to no results. In 1844 Sir Robert Peel appealed to Gregory XVI. against Repealers; later Lord Minto was sent to make another appeal to Pius IX. In 1881 Gladstone tried to get Newman to approach the Pope against the Parnellite agitation; the ill-fated Errington mission was sent for the same purpose. A few years later Lord Randolph Churchill proposed to govern Ireland by the bishops (who don't care a scrap about Home Rule, as he put it), so that "the tremendous

force of the Catholic Church would gradually and insensibly come over to the view of the Tory Party." Yet again, during the Home Rule Bill controversy a petition against it was signed by the Duke of Norfolk precisely on the ground that it would diminish the power of the priest.

As a matter of historical fact, the Irish Home Rulers have been singularly free from "Clericalism," and have always deeply resented an interference in politics, which perchance another generation may resent in matters of thought.

For example, when a Papal rescript in 1881 sought to interfere with the Parnell Tribute, the only effect it produced on the Irish people was—to change Peter's Pence into Parnell's pounds—£37,000 of them; and when the plan of campaign was condemned, not only was practically no notice taken of it, but the Archbishop of Cashel himself sent £50, while a meeting of some forty Catholic members at the Mansion House protested publicly against such "unwarrantable interference."

A persecuted priesthood such as was the lot of Irish Catholics in the dark days of persecution is quite different to a "dominant priesthood," and the peasant Celt's love for his "patriotic priest" may be not unjustly measured by his loathing, sometimes timid and half concealed, sometimes vigorous and open, for the "political cleric."

It is from this point of view that Michael McCarthy's *Priests and People in Ireland*, Frank Hugh O'Donnell's *Paraguay on Shannon*, and Pat's *The Sorrows of Ireland*, are written, in all of which cases there is perhaps more evidence of the vigorous lay than the venomous anti-clerical spirit.

As the Irish leader once assured the present Pope Pius X., the Irish Party is a National, not a Catholic Party. The Home Rule Movement, in other words, is a political, not a religious one; indeed, most of the Irish patriots, like Butt, Emmet, Lord Edward FitzGerald, Mitchell, Parnell, Davitt, and some of Ireland's greatest men of genius, like Burke, Swift, and Shaw, have

belonged to the newer faith which has won new respect with each new patriot, and may yet win equal respect when it shows equal patriotism. Very few, indeed, to-day believe that Home Rule means Rome Rule, and chief among those who have assisted in dispelling the delusion are men like Joseph Hocking (whose interesting volume, *Is Home Rule Rome Rule?* has just appeared), who cannot, I think, be suspected of any motives of sympathy with the Pope. But there are not wanting those, too, who go still further and say, like Bernard Shaw, that Home Rule means the end of Rome Rule.

Thus in his admirable preface to *John Bull's Other Island* he writes :—

“In an Irish Parliament the Roman Catholic Church, against which Dublin Castle is powerless, would meet the one force on earth that can cope with it victoriously ; that force is Democracy : a thing far more Catholic than itself. Until that force is let loose against it the Protestant garrison can do nothing to the priesthood except consolidate it and drive the people to rally round it in defence of their altar against the foreigner and the heretic. When this is let loose the Catholic laity will make short work of sacerdotal tyranny in Ireland as it has done in France and Italy. Home Rule will herald the day when the Vatican will go the way of Dublin Castle, and the Island of Saints assume the headship of its own Church.”

Perhaps the truest statement that was ever made upon the relation of Rome Rule to Home Rule is that of Dr. O'Dea, Bishop of Clonfert.

“I am convinced,” he once wrote in a report on education, “that if the void in the lay leadership of the country be filled up by higher education of the better classes of the Catholic party, the power of the priests, so far as it is abnormal or unnecessary, will pass away.”

It is a prophecy based upon the experience of democracy all over the world.

CHAPTER VIII

THE IMPERIAL ASPECT OF HOME RULE

THE "Imperial aspect" of Home Rule is the exordium and the peroration of every discussion on the Irish Question, and the fate of a Home Rule Bill not unnaturally depends entirely upon its consistency with autonomy and Empire. Indeed it is not an exaggeration to say that ninety-nine out of every hundred Englishmen are perfectly satisfied with the intrinsic value of Home Rule: the hundredth has only misgivings because of the possible consequences.

Nor is he to be blamed; for in the sphere of political economy, legislation is a form of motion, and should therefore be judged rather on "dynamic" than "static" principles. The question therefore comes to this: "How does Home Rule fit in with the scheme of Empire?"

From whatever standpoint this is approached the answer is unequivocal. Firstly, the Home Rule principle has been the one which has made the Empire in the past, and gives it its vigour to-day. We need only turn to the history of our American colonies to see this for ourselves.

At one time Canada was in almost every detail in the position of Ireland: two creeds, Catholic and Protestant, two races, English and French, two instincts, the Bureaucratic and the Democratic, were in continual opposition. In fact, when Queen Victoria ascended the throne the colonists were in armed rebellion.

The home officials in London spoke in much the same spirit as the Castle authorities do to-day, and the language of Sir Edward Carson was used by much abler though, as history has shown, no less misguided men. The Duke of Wellington himself said local responsible government was incompatible with the sovereignty of Great Britain, while Lord Stanley made a declaration almost word for word like that of Mr. Bonar Law.

The granting of the Canadian demand he said would ultimately mean, "The establishment of a Republic; the concession would remove every check to the tyrannical power of the dominant majority—a majority in numbers only, while in wealth, education, and enterprise they are greatly inferior to the minority. The minority of settlers were of British descent, and one thing was certain, if these settlers found themselves deprived of British protection, they would protect themselves."

Here too there was an ascendant party, mostly Church of England, in Bench, Magistracy, and Law; there were parallels, too, in boycotting, packed juries and cattle driving.

It is idle to emphasise the fallacy of the "unionist" principles, refuted to such an extent that to-day Canada is everywhere pointed to as the model of prosperity and loyalty; the example speaks for itself. As to the loss of the United States of America, I think there are very few historians who have not attributed it to the sheer obstinacy of Lord North and King George in refusing what after all was only autonomy in purely domestic concerns.

The second testimony to the Home Rule principle comes from what I would call the "Conscience of Empire." There is not a single one of the self-governing colonies which has not passed a resolution in favour of Home Rule for Ireland in its legislative chambers.

There are no less than twenty-eight Parliaments in the Empire, exclusive of such colonies as have partial self-government, through partly elected, partly nominated Legislatures or Legislative Councils; in other words, there exist some thirty-seven Home Rule Constitutions in the Empire.

It is not, however, in the public assemblies alone that Home Rule is declared the very keystone of Empire; its advocates number also some of the most noted and experienced of those we proudly call our Great "Proconsuls."

The late Mr. Cecil Rhodes, as we shall have occasion to mention again, was one of the most ardent personal

supporters of Mr. Parnell's Home Rule, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the ex-Premier of the Dominion of Canada, is as ardent a personal supporter of Mr. Redmond and modern Home Rule; so likewise is Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, Chairman of the Canadian-Pacific Railway. A testimony from Indian experience, again, comes in the person of Lord MacDonnell, a man who had nearly forty years' experience, and, in the words of Lord Lansdowne, had dealt with some of the most difficult problems of modern statesmanship. From South Africa comes another witness, a Premier who but ten years ago was a soldier in arms against England, and at home we have statesmen like Lord Haldane and Sir Edward Grey.

The unique position held to-day by the British Empire, in fact, is due solely to the Home Rule principle which has delegated its own central powers to its integral parts and allowed them to develop according to their own instincts and necessities.

France had colonies and governed them from Paris; Spain once held half a continent and ruled it from Madrid. Portugal was once the rival of England, France, and Spain in Asia, in Africa and America. To-day she has scarcely any possessions of any value. Holland once boasted that she ruled and she swept the seas. To-day she is one of the Protected Powers of Europe.

Returning to the case of Ireland, and judging of autonomy purely from the Imperial standpoint, what is likely to be its tendency? Frankly I answer, in all that the Englishman means by the term—decidedly Unionist, if not actually Imperialist.

I do not mean by "unionist" what the Irishman means, namely, "Bureaucratic Government run for the benefit of English Protestant settlers," but I mean that tendency to fusion of blood and thought which made the Normans more Irish than the Irish themselves, and may yet make Celts more anxious in keeping together the English-speaking peoples than the Anglo-Saxons.

No one denies that at times some of the Nationalist

leaders have been more outspoken than at others ; but it is too "un-English," I hope, to make party capital out of the agony cries of a nation in despair. No one cast Botha's heroism in his face when he appeared at the Coronation ; and if any forgiveness is required, it is on the part of Ireland and not England.

Had Unionists paid half as much attention to the pleading of the Irish leaders and the decisions of Royal Commissions as they have done to the "treason" of those whom their indifference exasperated, the Irish problem might never have existed. I think Mr. Gladstone's remarks on the subject are far more worthy of a great power, than all the continual carping of the "Orangemen."

Referring to the bitter days of persecution and coercion, he says :—

"All this led some of them to use from time to time expressions which I for one never thought it necessary to treat as involving moral delinquency, and for which I have found ample explanation in the conditions and the circumstances under which they spoke, and which stand in most favourable comparison with the means which had been habitually employed by the overpowering might of England, and by the ascendancy party in Ireland. But no more language of disaffection towards this country has been used since the door of hope has been opened."

What that door of hope was, as Mr. Gladstone called it, I will leave to one whom Cecil Rhodes looked upon as one of the "Fathers" of modern Imperialism—not Chamberlain, but C. S. Parnell. The interview of the two great men is graphically described by Mr. Barry O'Brien in his *Life of Parnell*, together with the conversation that took place, and bears very distinctly upon the now all-important question of guarantees.

Writing in a letter to Rhodes after the interview, on June 23, 1888, the Irish leader said :—

"I am very glad that you consider the measure of Home Rule to be granted to Ireland should be thoroughgoing, and should give her complete control over her own affairs without

reservation, and I cordially agree with your opinion that there should be effective safeguards for the maintenance of Imperial unity. Your conclusion as to the only alternative for Home Rule is also entirely my own, for I have long felt that the continuance of the present semi-constitutional system is quite impracticable. But to return to the question of the retention of the Irish members at Westminster. My own views upon the points and probabilities of the future, and the bearing of this subject upon the question of Imperial federation—my own feeling upon the measure is that if Mr. Gladstone includes in his next Home Rule measure the provisions of such retention we should cheerfully concur with him, and accept with goodwill and good faith, with the intention of taking our share in the Imperial partnership. I believe also that in the event I state this will be the case, and that the Irish people will cheerfully accept the duties and responsibilities assigned to them, and will justify the position given to them in the Imperial system.

“It does not come so much within my province to express a full opinion upon the larger question of Imperial federation, but I agree with you that the continued Irish representation at Westminster immensely facilitates such a step, while the contrary provision in the Bill of 1886 would have been a bar. Undoubtedly this is a matter which should be dealt with in accordance largely with the opinion of the colonies themselves, and if they should desire to share in the cost of Imperial matters, as undoubtedly they now do in the responsibility, and should express a wish for representation at Westminster, I certainly think it should be accorded to them, and that public opinion in these islands would unanimously concur in the necessary constitutional modifications.”

The course of public affairs has endorsed the views of both, and to-day the whole fate of the Bill depends entirely upon its “Imperial” feasibility, and I maintain it is a feasibility.

Just as the common sufferings of Irish history are the one great guarantee that there will never be any attempt to distinguish again Norman and Celt, so the Empire is in itself the great guarantee that in the future no one will be able to separate the Saxon from the Celt.

A common parentage has evolved itself in the colonies out of the numerous stocks that emigrated, a common aim has united them in building up the great dominions, common dangers have welded them in love, and a

common patriotism must consequently hold them together in its defence.

Everywhere in the colonies the Irish envoys of Home Rule find welcome; everywhere they find Irish rulers, Irish statesmen, Irish princes of commerce, Irish soldiers, Irish priests and Irish administrators; until at last they realise that Irish blood and Irish brains have made the Empire as much an Irish as an English one. What better guarantee than this? Separation is unthinkable, as the past is unchangeable.

Much is heard of "American dollars" in Tory textbooks, and "Foreign Rulers," but will "Unionists" explain what policy made that America foreign, and from what race those contributors are descended? An "Anglo-American" alliance is probably the desideratum of nearly every British statesman; the union of the English-speaking world is an idea which if realised would become one of the world forces of civilisation.

Yet what is it which keeps these two peoples apart save the Irish Question, that question which has existed from the time when, in the words of Lord Mountjoy, "America was lost by Irish emigrants," to the time when in our own day their ex-President Roosevelt said that the fate of the great "commercial treaty" hung upon the Irish policy of the present Government. At the Irish Banquet, only on last St. Patrick's Day, Mr. John O'Callaghan, the general secretary of the U.I.L. of America, was explaining how the whole continent was awaiting the Home Rule Bill to settle the great feud between the two great Empires, and how they were willing, once the Dublin Convention had decided the concession satisfactorily, to join hands and call things square.

What else does all this prove except the fact that the Irishman is a born Imperialist, and that Ireland is to-day more than a nation—and like England—a race.

Yet if it be said that the Irishman is an unconscious Imperialist, it can be said with no less truth that the Englishman is an unconscious Home Ruler. Let me show this.

A great statesman has recently said :—

“I cannot help thinking that as we in England have now thoroughly realised in every one of these great communities that each is to manage its own affairs, carry out its own life, make its own experiments as freely as if it was an independent political entity—as that is a truth thoroughly understood by every politician of every party in every one of these several communities—I cannot help thinking that upon that solid basis we shall build up something which the world has never yet seen, which political dreamers in the past have never yet dreamed of, a coalition of free and self-governing communities who feel that they are never more themselves, never more masters of their own fate, than when they recognise that they are parts of a greater whole, from which they can draw inspiration and strength ; and that each lives its own life, and is most itself when it feels itself in the fullest sense a self-governing entity which yet has a larger whole to look to, whose interests are not alien to it, on whom it can rest in time of trouble, from whom it can draw experience, to whom it can look, whom it can aid, and from whom it can receive aid.”

Is this Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Edward Grey, or John Redmond ? It is none of them : it is Mr. Balfour !

I had occasion the other day to give this quotation of Mr. Balfour's words as a definition of Home Rule. “Home Rule then, is nothing but common sense,” was the exclamation of surprise.

“It was never anything else,” I replied.

Whence then come these virulent denunciations of a measure which is endorsed by nearly every principle in our Constitution, by every colony in our Empire, and by every world-power ? Only from Ulster !

CHAPTER IX

THE ULSTER ASPECT OF HOME RULE

PROBABLY the only objection to Home Rule which has any concrete reality in the average elector's mind is the case of Ulster ; he believes that the union of the Empire entirely depends upon the loyalty of Ulster.

"The strongest objection," writes Mr. Bonar Law in a preface to *The Case for Home Rule* (F. Warne), "and in my opinion the insurmountable obstacle to Home Rule, is the injustice of attempting to impose it against their will upon the Unionists of Ulster. The only ground upon which Home Rule can now be defended is the nationality of Ireland. But Ireland is not a nation ; it is two nations, separated from each other by lines of cleavage which cut far deeper than those which separate Great Britain from Ireland as a whole."

Now if it is really the policy of Unionists to unite, this is not only false history but bad politics ; for this abnormal and deplorable picture is entirely posterior to the Act of 1801, which Grattan warned them over and over again would inevitably foster Separatism. Indeed, paradoxical as it may appear, the policy of Home Rulers has always been Unionist in tendency, while the actions of Unionists have always provoked Separatism.

Any one familiar with the history of Grattan's Parliament can testify to this. It was even one of its so-called dangers to England ; while any one reading the story of the Great Rebellion of '98, or the Great Conspiracies of the Fenians, will see at a glance that Republicanism was only advocated as a despairing alternative to Home Rule.

Whatever may have happened in the past, however, has very little weight in contemporary politics ; the great question is, "Does 'Orange Ulster'¹ stand for 'Empire' to-day ?"

It is very hard to describe an "Orangeman" in terms

¹ I use the term for what it is usually intended to convey in party apologetics.

of exact political thought. I have tried repeatedly and failed to gather any positive conception of him except as a personification of half intelligible fear. But Englishmen may be able to arrive at some kind of idea by the following process of elimination.

Firstly,¹ the "Orangeman" has as little right to the designation "Ulsterman" as the Tailors of Tooley Street had a right to call themselves "We, the People of England." As a matter of fact there are only ten seats out of thirty-three which have been consistently Orange, while fourteen have always been "Home Rule," nine having been held at times by either party, Liberals or Independents. At the present moment sixteen of the total thirty-three are Home Rule. There is only one county (Derry) which has not returned at least one Nationalist, and even there the Unionist majority was only 113. This cannot be due to any radical injustice which redistribution would change, for according to the census returns there were 104,507 Home Rule to 98,625 Unionist votes at the polls.

Secondly, the Ulsterman cannot define himself with any degree of accuracy as representing the Protestant Church in Ireland, for the religious distribution of the population is about the same as the political, comprising 48,490 Methodists, 366,171 Episcopalians, 421,566 Presbyterians, and 690,134 Catholics; so that the Catholic Church is the predominating denomination, and is nearly as big as all the other sects put together.

Thirdly, it is equally inaccurate to describe the "Ulstermen" as the law-abiding section of the community, for of the indictable offences committed in 1909 (the latest figures available), 4534 took place in Leinster, 3182 in Ulster, 1516 in Munster, and 641 in Connaught; whereas in claims for compensation for malicious injuries to property, Ulster heads the list with 329, Munster comes next with 286, Leinster follows with 159, and then Connaught with 107.

Fourthly, Ulster cannot claim to be the educated

¹ See that valuable handbook, *Home Rule in a Nutshell*, by Jeremiah MacVeagh.

province of Ireland, for statistics in 1901 showed that the percentage of persons over five able to read was: Leinster 83, Munster 81, Ulster 78, Connaught 72; while in 1910 the number of illiterate voters in Ulster was 12,995 as against a total for the three other provinces put together of 9510.

Fifthly, Ulster is not the wealthiest province by any means; if Belfast has its dockyards, Dublin has its breweries. It is poorer than Leinster, very little richer than Munster.

To quote, again, Mr. MacVeagh's admirable little compendium :—

"In the rateable value per head of the population the figures are: Leinster, £4, 8s. 9d.; Ulster, £3, 9s. 8d.; Munster, £3, 4s. 8d.; Connaught, £2, 5s. 1d. Taken by counties, the rateable valuation per head is higher in no less than thirteen counties in Leinster and Munster than in the highest county in Ulster (co. Down). Taking the thirty-nine counties and county boroughs in Ireland in order of rateable valuation per head, Belfast is twelfth, Down fifteenth, Monaghan eighteenth, Fermanagh nineteenth, Antrim twentieth, Armagh twenty-first, Tyrone twenty-fifth, Derry County twenty-sixth, Cavan twenty-ninth, Derry Borough thirtieth, and Donegal thirty-eighth."

Sixthly, Ulster is not, strictly speaking, prosperous, but rather only less unfortunate than the other provinces, for while Belfast has increased in population, the nine counties of Ulster for the last fifty years have diminished by over a million. The diminution of population is greater in Ulster than in the other provinces, and greatest in the Unionist counties of Antrim and Down.

Seventhly, the Ulsterman cannot pose as a secularist layman, for facts show him to be really twice as clerical as the Catholic. This is rather an interesting point, as it suggests that the real root of the political antagonism of the Protestants of the North towards Catholics as compared with the amicable relations which exist in the South is "Protestant Clericalism." Mr. Albert White makes a good point of this in a pamphlet on Home Rule :—

"It is said that Ireland is a priest-ridden country; that a

black army of priests is battenning on the people. We shall see. In 1905, the last statistics I have been able to get, there were 3542 priests in Ireland, or one for every 934 of the 3,301,661. Deduct priests disabled by old age and illness, or belonging to enclosed or teaching Orders and doing no parochial work, and there remain 2741, or one for every 1206 of the Catholic population. Compare the number of Protestant ministers in Ireland for the minority. There were (in 1903) 1724 parsons in Ireland for 581,089 Episcopalians. That is one for every 331. There were 800 Presbyterian ministers for 443,276 Presbyterians, or one for 554. There were 250 Methodist ministers for 62,000, or one for 248. So that, if the priests in Ireland were in the same proportion as the parsons, there would be 10,000 of them. If the parsons were only in the same proportions as the priests there would be only 600 of them."¹

Eighthly, the Ulstermen cannot be looked upon as the progressive or democratic party, for they have been the systematic opponents of all reforms, as Mr. Redmond points out—Catholic Emancipation, Abolition of Tithes, Extension of the Franchise, Disestablishment of the Church, Reform of the Land Laws, the Extension of Local Self-Government, the New University of Dublin, the Devolution Scheme, and Home Rule.

Ninthly, he is not the victim of Catholic intolerance ; for not only in Ulster is the Protestant treated with the utmost toleration, but throughout the rest of Ireland is exceptionally favoured by the Catholic population, as can be seen from the returns showing the relative numbers of the two religions employed by the much-abused County Councils.

ULSTER PROTESTANT PORTION.

County.	Population.		Per-centage.		Paid Officials.		Per-centage.	
	Cath.	Prot.	Cath.	Prot.	Cath.	Prot.	Cath.	Prot.
Armagh . .	56,000	68,000	45	55	3	47	6	94
Tyrone . .	82,000	68,000	55	45	5	47	10	90
Fermanagh .	36,000	29,000	55	45	17	58	23	77
Antrim . .	40,000	156,000	26	74	5	60	8	92

¹ *Home Rule for Ireland*, by Albert C. White, with a preface by L. G. Redmond-Howard, published by Liberal Open-Air Speakers' League, 41-42 Parliament Street, Westminster.

CATHOLIC PORTIONS OF IRELAND.

County.	Population.		Per-centage.		Paid Officials.		Per-centage.	
	Cath.	Prot.	Cath.	Prot.	Cath.	Prot.	Cath.	Prot.
Galway . .	180,000	12,000	94	6	50	11	81	19
Cork . . .	365,000	38,000	90	10	151	40	79	21
Cavan . . .	79,000	18,000	80	20	30	26	53	47
Westmeath .	57,000	5,000	91	9	37	17	68	32
King's Co. .	54,300	6,000	89	11	21	19	52	48
Monaghan .	55,000	20,000	66	34	34	23	59	41
Kildare . .	55,000	9,000	85	15	31	9	77	23
Clare ¹ . . .	110,000	2,000	98	2	62	6	90	10
Roscommon .	100,000	2,500	97	3	48	8	84	16
Sligo . . .	76,000	8,000	90	10	58	14	80	20
Mayo . . .	195,000	4,500	98	2	69	8	89	11
Queen's Co. .	50,000	6,000	89	11	25	11	70	30
Tipperary .	151,000	9,500	94	6	43	17	71	29
Leitrim . .	63,000	7,000	89	11	22	10	69	31
Carlow . . .	33,000	4,000	89	11	27	18	60	40
Kerry . . .	160,000	5,000	97	3	93	10	83	17
Meath . . .	62,000	5,000	92	8	38	14	73	27

Tenthly, he is not particularly loyal, were he to be taken at his word ; though, as a matter of fact, very little notice can be taken of outbursts such as those which, when Queen Victoria assented to the Dis-establishment Act, threatened to kick her Crown into the Boyne ; or when Edward VII. sanctioned the Irish University Act, swore it would make his throne rock ; or again, the cries we hear to-day about Provisional Government, supplies of German guns and Civil War.

It was only last June that Judge Rentoul, formerly the Orange member for East Down, wrote :—

“ I have spoken on many hundreds of Unionist platforms in all parts of England and Scotland, and have spoken for and with a large proportion of the Unionist members for each of the four Parliaments in which I sat, and for, at least, half of the members of the Governments of my Party ; and there are two arguments which I never used in my life, nor was, I believe, ever on the platform with an English member who used them, nor did any

¹ In Clare the Protestants hold all the best paying positions under the County Council, including the County Surveyor, three assistant surveyorships, Chief Clerk in the County Surveyor's office, and Secretary to the Council.

man for whom I spoke, ever wish me to use them. These arguments were—(1) That there would be danger of religious persecution in Ireland if Home Rule were granted; and (2) that 'Ulster would fight, and Ulster would be right' if Home Rule were granted. I thought we had a strong enough case, and enough solid arguments, without using arguments which, so far as I could learn, English audiences did not believe in, and which I thought weakened the good arguments which we had."

The only point about which Unionist handbooks are accurate in their descriptions of the "Orangeman" is, that he is a minority.

The Ulsterman is the anomaly of English Unionist statesmanship. He has been artificially prevented from fusion with the national politics because of his creed, and from understanding Catholicism because of his policy.

"In instincts," says a writer, "he is not an Englishman, because he has none of his democratic ideas of toleration in religion, or equality in politics. Nor is he an Irishman, because he lacks that power to combine and adapt himself to surroundings which has made the Celtic race the citizen as well as the nursery of the world. He is rather a bad sort of Scotsman—with apologies to Scotsmen—the hard selfish exploiter, backed by the strength of those whom he has deceived into representing and impeding that very mission of Empire of which he was intended to be the pioneer.

"The existence in certain nooks and corners of Ireland of a democratic vote hostile to Home Rule," writes Mr. Kettle in his *Open Secret in Ireland*, "is, let us confess, a conundrum; but is a conundrum of psychology rather than politics. It may seem rude to say so, but Orangeism consists mainly of a settled hallucination and an annual brainstorm. No one who has not been present at a Twelfth of July procession can realise how completely all its manifestations belong to the life of hysteria and not to that of 'politics,' which Mr. Paul Dubois describes as 'demagogic orgies with a mixed inspiration of Freemasonry and the Salvation Army.'"

This language may seem hard on the Orangeman, but it is exactly in the tone of his own onslaughts.

The average Englishman has no idea of an Orangeman because he has had no example of the type, and it would need a herculean effort of the imagination, such

as picturing Kensit as a Unionist Prime Minister in delirium tremens; for he must on no account be confounded with the average Protestant. Certainly his fears about persecutions under Home Rule must have no weight when openly denied by men like Mr. Walter Long, Lord Aberdeen, the late Earl Spencer, Lord Pirrie, Lord Dunraven, Sir Horace Plunkett, Judge Rentoul, the Rev. Silvester Horne, and the hundred or more eminent Protestants whose testimony has been gathered together by Mr. MacVeagh's *Home Rule or Rome Rule*, published by the *Morning Leader*.

The time has come when point for point he must give an account of this stewardship and argue his case before the great jury of Public Opinion. The Empire does not exist for the Orangeman, but the Orangeman for the Empire; that is his *ratio existentiæ* in Ireland. He must not become a hindrance to an Anglo-Irish *entente*.

No demonstration which has not its root deep down in a concrete grievance is of any value at this crisis; and the Englishman least of all is likely to be affected by what he is accustomed to despise as mere agitation. Nationalists succeeded, as the statutes themselves testify, only because of the objectivity of their patriotism. If Orangeism fails it will be because it is a bigotry bankrupt of ideas—for one looks vainly among their pamphlets and publications for any constructive programme for the future, or any sympathy with the great struggles of the past.

One of the greatest fallacies of English "Conservatism" has been to become unionist and identify itself with Irish "unionism," for as a matter of fact the two have nothing in common. The one denotes that cohesive principle which has been able to dominate and to retain and to unite, the other is its very opposite, keeping up an hostile and ascendant minority to the perpetual danger of the whole.

The trouble from the English electoral point of view, however, is different. The "Union" of the two Parliaments has meant not only an Ireland almost beggared, but it has meant a course of legislation for England

passed by the balance of parties for reasons extrinsic to her own needs—a danger which still continues and affects both English parties equally, and may yet decide the great battles of Socialism and Free Trade in any direction.

No constitutional protest is possible; the title-deeds of dictatorship are the very articles of the Union; but it must never be forgotten that it is English Conservatives who are keeping up this chaos for the electoral mind, and English Liberals who wish to restore an English decision to an English Parliament.

It has been equally fatal to both countries; for Anglophobia, so great is the assimilating power of the Celt, might have never been the skeleton it now is had not England risked her fate by the suicidal policy of identifying herself with "Orange ascendancy" in Ireland.

It is not surprising that there should be an "Orange" opposition to "Home Rule"—all ascendancies fight for their existence; but, as Mr. Ramsay MacDonald suggested, the English mind is becoming rather suspicious of a quasi "religious-industrial" opposition to Home Rule, headed by a party of large capitalists and pushing placemen, which is making this outcry against democratic principles; and it is not at all unlikely that Belfast's real grievance, the Labour problem, is being covered over by these frenzied demonstrations, for in the words of Alfred Webb, "Where else but in Ireland do men plume themselves on esteeming their fellow-countrymen unfit for the management of their own affairs?"

What I feel most myself is the hideous chasm that separates all Irish life into water-tight compartments and shifts the arena of controversies outside the country with consequent schism of parties until the final settlement—the brain-waste!

Generation after generation comes along; they are educated in different schools—Nationalists in Ireland, Unionists in England, even though both be Catholics; they start their manhood in different universities; they commence public life in different political parties

—members of different organisations : move socially in spheres as distinct as Indian castes—the Castle and the Parliamentary—and never really meet face to face save as opponents in a perplexed assembly of Englishmen, shrugging their shoulders in ignorance and only prepared to keep up the *status quo*, euphemistically called Peace.

The only solution must come from Ulster through Home Rule. “The Orangeman must get on or get out.” I do not mean he must be suppressed, but drawn back into the old national life of the country ; a civil war is unthinkable ; a special Ulster Parliament would only make matters worse.

Whatever genuine principles underlie the “Ulster Spirit,” as it is called, they will receive far more attention and have far more weight in a Dublin Parliament with a voice of some fifty members, than the little party of sixteen can have in an assembly of over six hundred men tired—*ad nauseam*—of its complaints.

The Irish Question must be settled once and for all ; the only way is to allow it to settle itself by bringing all the different politicians and thinkers in Ireland together on the same platform of public opinion, namely, a Parliament, there to work out their own national salvation under the guardianship of the Empire they will find it to their own interest to love and cherish.

APPENDIX

THE HOME RULE BILL, 1912

ON Thursday, April 12, 1912, Mr. Asquith introduced a "Bill to amend the provision for the Government of Ireland," the chief provisions of which are summarised below. Mr. Redmond received this Bill with the following words: "Viewing this Bill as a whole, I say here—and I speak for my colleagues on these benches—that this is a great measure, and a measure adequate to carry out the objects of its promoters. It is a great measure, and we welcome it." The first reading was carried on April 16th by a majority of 94. On April 22 a resolution welcoming the Bill was carried unanimously, amid great cheering, by the National Convention in Dublin.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Legislative Authority.—Clause I. provides that there shall be in Ireland an Irish Parliament consisting of the King and two Houses, namely, the Irish Senate and the Irish House of Commons; but that the supreme power and authority of the U.K. Parliament shall remain unaffected and undiminished over all persons, matters, and things within the King's dominions.

Clause II. empowers the Irish Parliament to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Ireland, in respect of matters exclusively relating to Ireland or some part thereof, and withholds power to make laws in respect of (1) The Crown, or the Succession, or a Regency; or (2) The making of peace or war or matters arising from a state of war; (3) Naval or military matters; (4) Treaties, Foreign or Imperial relations, extradition of criminals; (5) Dignities or titles of honour; (6) Treason, naturalisation, or aliens; (7) Trade with any place out of Ireland, quarantine or navigation, including merchant shipping (with certain exceptions concerning local taxation, health, and inland waters); (8) Lighthouses, buoys, or beacons; (9) Coinage, legal tender, weights and measures; (10) Trade marks, designs, merchandise marks, copyright, or patent rights; or (11) Any of the following reserved matters:—(a) The general subject-matter of the Land Purchase Acts, Old Age Pensions Acts, National Insurance Act, and Labour Exchanges Act; (b) Collection of taxes; (c) Royal Irish Constabulary; (d) Post Office Savings Banks, Trustee Savings Banks, and Friendly Societies; and (e) Public loans made in Ireland *before the passing of the Act*.

Clause III. prohibits the Irish Parliament from making laws to establish or endow any religion, prohibit the free exercise thereof, or give a preference, privilege, or advantage, or impose any disability or disadvantage, on account of religious belief or status, or make any religious belief or religious ceremony a condition of the validity of any marriage.

Executive Authority.—In terms of Clause IV. the executive power in Ireland shall continue vested in the King, and as respects Irish services the Lord Lieutenant shall exercise any prerogative or other executive power delegated to him by His Majesty, through such Irish Departments as may be established by Irish Act or, subject thereto, by the Lord Lieutenant. The heads of such Irish Departments and such other persons (if any) as the Lord Lieutenant may appoint, shall be the Irish Ministers, who for the time being shall be an Executive Committee of the Privy Council of Ireland, to aid and advise the Lord Lieutenant in the exercise of his executive power in relation to Irish services.

Clause V. provides for the future transfer of certain reserved services: (1) The management and control of the Royal Irish Constabulary shall be transferred to the Irish Government on the expiration of six years. (2) If a resolution is passed by both Houses of the Irish Parliament public services in connexion with the administration of the Old Age Pensions Acts, 1908 and 1911, Parts I. and II. of the National Insurance Act, 1911; the Labour Exchanges Act, 1909; Post Office Savings Banks, Trustee Savings Banks, and Friendly Societies shall be transferred to the Irish Government, not less than a year after the date on which the resolution is passed. This provision, however, shall not take effect as respects Post Office Savings Banks, Trustee Savings Banks, and Friendly Societies until the expiration of ten years.

Irish Parliament.—Clause VI. provides that there shall be a session of the Irish Parliament once at least in every year, and (VII.) the Lord Lieutenant shall give or withhold Royal assent to Bills, subject to the following limitations: (1) He shall comply with any instructions given by His Majesty; (2) He shall, if required, postpone giving Royal assent for such period as His Majesty may direct.

The Irish Senate (VIII.) shall consist of forty senators, the first to be nominated by the Lord Lieutenant according to any instructions given by His Majesty, and afterwards by the Lord Lieutenant on the advice of the Executive Committee. The term of office of senators shall be eight years, and shall not be affected by a dissolution; one fourth to retire every second year, and their seats to be filled by new nomination.

The Irish House of Commons (IX.) shall consist of one hundred and sixty-four members, returned by constituencies named in the First Schedule, and elected by the same electors and in the same manner as members returned by constituencies in Ireland to serve in the U.K. Parliament. The Irish House of Commons shall, unless sooner dissolved, continue for not more than five years from the day of summons. *After three years from the passing of the Act,* the Irish Parliament may alter, as respects the Irish House of Commons, the qualification of the electors, the mode of election, the constituencies, and the distribution of the members of the House among the constituencies, provided that the number of the members shall not be altered, and due regard shall be had to the population of the constituencies other than University constituencies.

Bills appropriating revenue or money (X.), or imposing taxation shall originate only in the Irish House of Commons, which shall not adopt or pass any resolution, address, or Bill for the appropriation for any purpose of any part of the public revenue of Ireland or of any tax, except in pursuance of a recommendation from the Lord Lieutenant. The Irish Senate may not reject any Bill which deals only with the imposition of taxation or appropriation of revenue or money, and may not amend any Bill so far as the Bill imposes taxation or appropriates revenue or money, or so as to increase any proposed

burden on the people. Any Bill which appropriates revenue or money for the ordinary annual services of the Irish Government shall deal only with that appropriation. In the event of continued disagreement between the two Irish Houses (XI.), a joint sitting may be convened and the matter in dispute settled by a joint vote.

The powers, privileges, and immunities of members of the Irish Parliament (XII.) may be defined by Irish Act, but shall never exceed those enjoyed by the U.K. House of Commons. Any peer, whether of the United Kingdom, Great Britain, England, Scotland, or Ireland, shall be qualified to be a member of either House. Irish Ministers shall have the right to sit and speak in both Houses, but shall vote only in the House of which they are members.

Unless and until the U.K. Parliament otherwise determine (XIII.), the number of members returned by constituencies in Ireland to serve in the U.K. Parliament shall be forty-two, the constituencies returning those members being named in the First Schedule. No University in Ireland shall return a member to the U.K. Parliament.

Finance.—There shall be an Irish Exchequer and an Irish Consolidated Fund (XIV.) separate from those of the United Kingdom. All taxes levied in Ireland, whether under the authority of the U.K. Parliament or of the Irish Parliament, shall be paid into the U.K. Exchequer, *but there shall be charged on, and paid out of the U.K. Consolidated Fund in each year to the Irish Exchequer a sum (the "Transferred Sum") consisting of—*(a) *such sum as may be determined by the Joint Exchequer Board established under this Act to represent the net cost to the U.K. Exchequer at the time of the passing of this Act of Irish services; and* (b) *a sum of five hundred thousand pounds, diminishing in each year after the third year of payment by the sum of fifty thousand pounds until it is reduced to the sum of two hundred thousand pounds; and* (c) *a sum equal to the proceeds as determined by the Joint Exchequer Board of any Irish taxes imposed in Ireland by the Irish Parliament.* Provision shall be made by the Irish Parliament for the cost of Irish services, and any charge on the U.K. Consolidated Fund for those services shall cease, and money for loans in Ireland shall cease to be advanced either by the Public Works Loans Commissioners or out of the Local Loans Fund.

The Irish Parliament (XV.) shall have power to vary either by way of addition, reduction, or discontinuance, any Imperial tax (i.e. a tax levied under the authority of the U.K. Parliament), so far as respects the levy of that tax in Ireland, and to impose in Ireland any independent tax not being in the opinion of the Joint Exchequer Board substantially the same in character as an Imperial tax, subject to the following limitations:—(a) The Irish Parliament shall not have power to impose or charge a Customs duty, whether an import or an export duty, on any article unless that article is for the time being liable to a Customs duty levied as an Imperial tax; (b) The benefit to accrue to the Irish Exchequer from any addition to any Customs duty levied as an Imperial tax (other than a Customs duty on beer or spirits), or to any duty of income tax so levied, or to any death duty so levied, shall be limited as in this Act provided; (c) Stamp duties mentioned in the Second Schedule may not be varied; (d) no variation of Customs or Excise duties may be made the effect of which will be to cause the Customs duty on an article of a class produced, prepared or manufactured in Ireland, to exceed the Excise duty by more than an amount reasonably sufficient to cover any expenses due to Excise restrictions.

Any articles (XVI.) brought into Great Britain from Ireland or *vice versa* shall be deemed articles exported or imported for the purposes of information to be furnished under the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, and Section IV. of the Revenue Act, 1909, and for the purpose of any duty or drawback payable in the circumstances for which provision is made under this section, but not for any other purpose. Where a Customs duty is levied in one country and not in the other, or is levied in both countries but at a higher rate in the one country than in the other, duty shall be charged and drawback allowed in respect of articles being articles produced, prepared, or manufactured abroad as follows :—(a) *The Customs duty shall be charged on any such articles brought into the one country from the other country as if they were articles imported from abroad, except that in the case of articles produced abroad but manufactured or prepared in the country from which they are sent, the Customs duty charged shall, if the drawback which would be allowed on the exportation of similar articles from the country into which the articles are brought is less than the duty payable on importation, be a duty equal to the drawback; and (b) A drawback shall be allowed on any such articles sent from the one country into the other equal to the drawback which would be allowed upon the exportation of the articles from the country from which they are sent. In the case of Excise duties a similar provision is made.*

In the event of the reduction or discontinuance of any Imperial tax by the Irish Parliament (XVII.), the Transferred Sum shall be reduced correspondingly. If in any financial year the proceeds of any Irish tax imposed as an addition to any Customs duty levied as an Imperial tax (other than a Customs duty on beer or spirits), or to any duty of Income tax so levied, or to any death duty so levied, exceed *one-tenth* of the proceeds in Ireland of that duty as levied as an Imperial tax for the same period, the amount of the excess shall not be treated for the purposes of this Act as part of the proceeds of the Irish tax, and the amount payable to the Irish Exchequer in respect of the proceeds of the Irish tax shall be reduced accordingly.

When any reserved service is transferred from the U.K. Government to the Irish Government, the Transferred Sum shall be increased accordingly.

Sums arising out of the Irish Land Purchase Acts which would otherwise have been made good from the Guarantee Fund (XVIII.) shall be deducted from Transferred Sum. The powers of the Development Commissioners or the Road Board with respect to Ireland (XIX.) under the Development and Road Improvement Funds Act 1909 shall remain unimpaired, and the net proceeds of duties on motor spirits and motor cars in Ireland shall not be regarded as proceeds of an Imperial tax levied on Ireland. The Irish Church Temporalities Fund (XX.) shall be administered by the Irish Government as directed by Irish Act, but existing charges shall be paid from U.K. Exchequer and deducted from Transferred Sum.

All sums paid into the Irish Exchequer (XXI.) shall form a Consolidated Fund, and shall not be applied for any purpose for which they are not appropriated by Irish Act. An officer shall be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant to be the Irish Comptroller and Auditor-General.

The Joint Exchequer Board shall (XXII.) consist of two members appointed by the Treasury and two members appointed by the Irish Treasury and a Chairman appointed by His Majesty. The decision of the Board on any matter which is to be determined by them shall be final and conclusive.

Clause XXIII. empowers the Joint Exchequer Board to undertake on behalf

of the Irish Government the issue and management of loans, if provision is made by Irish Act for securing any loan varied by the Government of Ireland upon the Transferred Sum; XXIV. deals with the means of ascertaining the true Irish revenue; and XXV. declares that alterations of taxes are to be treated as increases or reductions of taxes.

If the Joint Exchequer Board (XXVI.) finds that the Irish Revenues for three successive years exceed the Transferred Sum, together with the cost of temporarily reserved services, a report shall be presented to the Treasury and Lord Lieutenant, who shall lay it before the U.K. Parliament and the Irish Parliament, respectively. This shall be taken as proper ground for revision by the U.K. Parliament of the financial provisions of this Act, with a view to securing a proper contribution from Irish revenues towards the U.K. common expenditure and extending the powers of the Irish Parliament with respect to taxation. For the purpose of revising the financial provisions of this Act in pursuance of this section, there shall be summoned to the U.K. Parliament such number of members of the Irish House of Commons as will make the representation of Ireland there equivalent to the representation of Great Britain on the basis of population; and such members of the Irish House of Commons shall be deemed members of the U.K. Parliament for any such revision.

His Majesty may by Order in Council make such provision for so summoning the members of the Irish House of Commons as His Majesty may think necessary or proper.

Judicial Power.—*After the passing of the Act* (XXVII.), Judges shall be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant, and their tenure of office, salary, and pension are safeguarded as at present.

The appeal from courts in Ireland to the House of Lords (XXVIII.) shall cease; and where any person would, but for this Act, have a right to appeal from any court in Ireland to the House of Lords, that person shall have the like right to appeal to His Majesty the King in Council.

If it appears to the Lord Lieutenant or a Secretary of State expedient in the public interest that steps shall be taken for the speedy determination of the question whether any Irish Act or any provision thereof (XXIX.), or any Irish Bill or any provision thereof, is beyond the powers of the Irish Parliament, he may represent the same to His Majesty in Council, and thereupon the said question shall be forthwith referred to and heard and determined by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Clause XXX. makes further provision for appeal in cases where the validity of an Irish law is questioned.

Every one irrespective of his religious belief (XXXI.) shall be qualified to hold office as Lord Lieutenant, whose term shall be six years. The Lord Lieutenant's salary and expenses shall be paid by the U.K. Parliament, but £5000 shall be deducted yearly from the Transferred Sum towards the salary.

All existing judges of the Supreme Court (XXXII.), and county court judges, and all existing Irish officers serving in an established capacity in the civil service of the Crown and receiving salaries charged on the U.K. Consolidated Fund shall be removeable only in the same manner as before; and shall receive the same salaries, gratuities, and pensions, and be liable to perform the same duties, and their salaries and pensions shall be paid out of the U.K. Exchequer, and deducted from the Transferred Sum.

Civil Service.—All other existing Irish officers in the civil service of the Crown shall (XXXIII.) hold their offices by the same tenure and upon the same terms and conditions (including conditions as to remuneration and superannuation) as theretofore and shall be liable to perform the same duties as theretofore. Provided that any existing Irish officer may be removed from his office *after the passing of this Act* by the Lord Lieutenant. The provisions as to compensation contained in the Third Schedule to the Act shall apply with respect to any such existing Irish officer.

For the purpose of the provisions of this Act with respect to existing officers there shall be established (XXXIV.) a committee to be called the Civil-Service Committee, of three members, one appointed by the Treasury, one by the Executive Committee, and the chairman by the Lord Chief Justice of England. The determination of the Civil Service Committee on any question which is to be determined by them under the provisions of this Act relating to existing officers shall be final and conclusive.

Pensions due to judges (XXXV.) or constables at time of passing of this Act *shall be paid by the U.K. Parliament*, and deducted from the Transferred Sum.

Any officer (XXXVI.) shall be deemed to be an Irish officer who is serving or employed in Irish services within the meaning of this Act.

All constables of the Dublin Metropolitan Police and of the Royal Irish Constabulary (XXXVII.) serving on the day of transfer shall after that day continue to serve on the same terms and conditions as theretofore, and shall be liable to perform the same duties. Existing enactments as to pay or pensions shall continue to apply.

General and Transitory Provisions.—Existing laws, institutions, and authorities in Ireland, judicial, administrative, or ministerial, and all existing taxes in Ireland (XXXVIII.) shall continue with the modifications necessary for adapting them to this Act, and subject, as respects matters within the powers of the Irish Parliament, to repeal, abolition, alteration, and adaptation as authorised by this Act.

Crown lands and property in Ireland (XXXIX.) may be placed under the control of the Irish Government.

Arrangements may be made for mutual assistance by Government Departments of the United Kingdom (XL.) and Irish Departments.

The Irish Parliament (XLI.) shall not have power to repeal or alter any provision of this Act (except as is specially provided by this Act), or of any Act passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom after the passing of this Act and extending to Ireland, although that provision deals with a matter with respect to which the Irish Parliament have powers to make laws.

The Irish Parliament (XLII.) shall be summoned to meet on the *first Tuesday in September nineteen hundred and thirteen*. Upon the first meeting of the Irish Parliament, the Irish members in the Parliament in the United Kingdom shall vacate their seats, and writs shall be issued for an election of members to serve in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Existing election laws relating to the House of Commons of the United Kingdom shall, so far as applicable, extend to the Irish House of Commons.

Clauses XLIII., XLIV., XLV. authorise such temporary payments and arrangements as are necessary for bringing the Act into operation and setting the Irish Parliament Government in motion.

The appointed day for the purposes of this Act shall be the day for the first meeting of the Irish Parliament (XLVI.), or such other day not more

than six months earlier or later, as may be fixed by Order of His Majesty in Council.

Clause XLVII. contains Supplemental Definitions.

Clause XLVIII. gives the "short title"—the Irish Government Act, 1912.

First Schedule.—Part I. gives the constituencies and number of members of the Irish House of Commons, which will consist of 34 Borough members, 123 County members, and 2 University (Dublin) members. The Borough members are as follows: Dublin:—College Green, 3; Harbour, 3; St. Stephen's Green, 2; St. Patrick's, 3. Belfast:—East, 5; South, 3; West, 2; North 4. Londonderry, 2; Cork, 4; Limerick, 2; Waterford, 1. Total, 34.

The Ulster Counties will be represented by 43 members, the Leinster Counties by 30, the Munster Counties by 30, and the Connaught Counties by 25.

Part II. deals with the representation of Ireland in the House of Commons of the United Kingdom, and gives the constituencies and number of members. These will consist of 8 Borough members and 34 County members. Dublin will send 3 members to Westminster; Belfast 4, and Cork 1. The Ulster Counties will have a representation of 11; the Leinster Counties, 8; Munster Counties, 9, and Connaught Counties, 6.

Second Schedule.—A list of the Stamp Duties which may not be altered by the Irish Parliament, viz. Duties on the following instruments:—Marketable securities; Share warrants and stock certificates to bearer (including instruments to bearer on which duty is charged by virtue of subsection (2) of section four or section five or section six of the Finance Act, 1899); Transfers of stocks, shares, and marketable securities (including composition for duty on any such transfers); Bills of Exchange and promissory notes; Contract notes; Letters of allotment, letters of renunciation, and scrip certificates; Statements as to amount of capital of corporations or companies with limited liability, and as to amount of capital contributed by limited partner; Statements as to amount proposed to be secured by issue of loan capital; Mortgages to secure debenture stock; Policies of sea insurance; Policies of life insurance.

Third Schedule.—Provisions as to compensation of existing Irish Officers.

Fourth Schedule.—Provision as to compensation of members of the Royal Irish Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

IT would be impossible to enumerate anything like a complete bibliography of the Home Rule Question, but the following may be taken as some of the leading and characteristic expositions of the Irish demand.

HISTORICAL

- Joyce, P. W. *A Social History of Ancient Ireland*. 2 vols.
 Bagwell, Richard. *Ireland under the Tudors and Stuarts*. 5 vols.
 Dalton, E. A. *History of Ireland*. 3 vols.
 Froude, J. A. *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*. 3 vols.
 Lecky, W. E. H. *Leaders of the Public Opinion in Ireland. History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*. 5 vols.
Cambridge Modern History, vol. vi. ch. xiv.; ("Ireland in the Eighteenth Century"), R. Dunlop; vol. ix. ch. xxii. ("Great Britain and Ireland"), 1792-1815, G. P. Gooch. ("From the Union to the Present Day"), vol. x. ch. xix., H. W. Morris; vol. x. ch. xx., G. P. Gooch; vol. xii. ch. iv., R. Dunlop.
 Green, Mrs. J. R. *The Making of Ireland and her Undoing. Irish Nationality*.
 Macneill, J. G. Swift. *The Irish Parliament; what it was and what it did*.
 Chart, D. A. *Ireland from the Union to Catholic Emancipation*.
 Bussy, Frederick Moir. *Irish Conspiracies*.
 Anderson, Sir Robert. *Sidelights on the Home Rule Movement*.
 O'Connor, T. P. *The Parnell Movement*.
 Duffy, Sir Charles Gavan. *Young Ireland*.
 Dunraven, Lord. *The Outlook in Ireland. The Legacy of Past Years*.
 O'Brien, R. Barry. *A Hundred Years of Irish History. Studies in Irish History. Life of Parnell. Dublin Castle and the Irish People*.
 O'Brien, William. *Recollections. An Olive Branch in Ireland*.
 McCarthy, J. F. *Priests and People in Ireland. Rome in Ireland*.
 Dubois, Paul. *Contemporary Ireland*.
 Murray, Miss. *The History of the Commercial Relations of England and Ireland*.
 Plunkett, Sir Horace. *Ireland in the New Century*.
 Morley, Lord. *Life of Gladstone*.

POLITICAL

Among some of the most popular handbooks may be mentioned—

- Redmond-Howard. *John Redmond: the Man and the Demand.*
 Childers. *The Framework of Home Rule.*
Home Rule Problems. Edited by Basil Williams.
 Gwynn, Stephen. *The Case for Home Rule.*
 Kettle, Professor. *The Open Secret in Ireland.*
 Kettle, Professor. *Home Rule Finance.*
 Spender, Harold. *Home Rule.*
What Home Rule Means. Published by Mansell.
 Hocking, Joseph. *Is Home Rule Rome Rule?*
 Redmond, John. *Some Arguments for Home Rule.*
 Morgan, J. T. *Home Rule: A Critical Examination.*
The Case for the Union. With Introduction by Sir Edward Carson.
 Smith, P. Kerr, M.P. *The Peril of Home Rule.*
 Amery, L. S., M.P. *The Case Against Home Rule.*

Also pamphlets like Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh's excellent *Home Rule in a Nutshell*, and the *Daily News*, *Fifty Points for Home Rule*, and the monthly publication of the Liberal Home Rule Committee, *Home Rule Notes*, and the publications of the Irish Press Agency of Great Smith St., Victoria.

INDEX

- Balfour, Mr., on self-government, 55, 75
 Biggar, Mr., 35, 36
 Bright, John, quoted, 31
 Bureaucracy in Ireland, 16, 20, 23, 24, 25, 29, 37, 38, 46, 47, 51, 52, 55, 71
 Burke, quoted, 13, 45
 Butt, Isaac, 35, 43, 47, 67
 Chamberlain, Joseph, on Irish Local Government, 54
 "Castle" government, 12, 13, 23, 25, 29, 37, 38, 55, 56, 57
 Catholic Emancipation Act, 32, 33, 66
 Catholics and Protestants in Ulster, 60
 County Councils, Irish, 53
 Davis, Thomas, 29, 33
 Davitt, 29, 67
 founder of Land League, 35
 Desmond's Rebellion, 17
 Dicey, Prof., quoted, 11, 27, 28
 Dillon, John Blake, 34, 36
 Disraeli on Home Rule, 11
 Duffy, Sir Charles Gavan, 33
 Dunraven, Lord, 29
 on Home Rule, 51
 on Castle Government, 56, 57
 on Catholic disabilities, 63
 Emigration from Ireland, 19, 34, 38-40
 Emmet, Robert, 29, 30, 67
 English Parliament, Irish party in, 50
 Evictions, 40
 Famine in Ireland, 33, 36
 Fenian movement, the, 34
 FitzGerald, Lord Edward, 30, 67
 Fox, on Irish affairs, 45
 Froude, quoted, 31
 Gladstone, Home Rule Bills of, 49, 50
 on Fenianism, 35
 on Home Rule, 72
 on Taxation, 43
 Grattan, industrial revival under, 41
 Parliament of, 20, 21, 24, 25, 76
 quoted, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27
 Gwynn, Mr. Stephen, on Home Rule, 51
 Home Rule, constitutional aspect of, 45-52
 economic aspect of, 53-60
 historical survey, 11, 14, *et seq.*
 Imperial aspect of, 69-75
 religious aspect of, 60-63
 Ulster aspect of, 76-84
 Home Rule Bills, 1886 and 1893, 49, 50
 Home Rule Bill, 1912, 50. *See* Appendix, p. 85
 Home Rule Convention, 1873, Resolutions of, 48, 49
 Ireland, British Rule in, 14, *et seq.*
 cost of Civil Service in, 56, 57
 financial position, 42, 56, 57
 fiscal relations, 43
 population, 38
 religious problem, 59
 taxation, 43
 trade conditions, 41, 58
 Union with England, 21, *et seq.*
 Irish party in English Parliament, 50
 Land Laws, Irish, 33, 34, 35, 40, 44
 Land League, the, 35
 Lansdowne, Lord, quoted, 55
 Local Government Act, 37, 53, 54
 MacDonnell, J. E., on finance of Ireland, 57
 McNeill, Swift, quoted, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 24
 Mitchell, John, 83, 34
 O'Brien, Smith, 34, 36
 "Obstruction policy" of Parnell, 36
 O'Connell, Daniel, 29, 32, 33, 47
 Orangemen, position of, 72, 76-77, 81, 82, 83, 84
 Parliament, Irish, constitution of, 21
 financial position of, 42, 43
 historical, 12, *et seq.*
 Parnell, letter to Rhodes, 72
 "Obstruction" policy of, 35, 36
 quoted, 29, 67
 Poynings' Act, 14
 Priestcraft in Ireland, 67, 68
 Protestants in Ireland, position of, 60, *et seq.*
 Railways, Irish, 58
 Rebellions, Irish, 25, 26, 39
 Redevale, Lord, quoted, 31
 Redmond, John, 29, 36, 37
 on Irish Local Government, 53
 Rhodes, Cecil, 70, 72
 Russell, T. W., 29
 Salisbury, Lord, on Irish Local Government, 53
 Separatist Republican movement, 47, 76
 Shaw, Bernard, quoted, 63
 Sheridan, quoted, 46
 Ulster, position under Home Rule, 76-84
 Union with Ireland, the, 21
 failure of schemes for readjustment of, 35, 37, 44
 financial position under, 56-59
 religious difficulties under, 64, 65
 Republican Separatist movement against, 47
 social state of Ireland under, 38
 Wyndham Act, 1902, 37, 44

THE PEOPLE'S BOOKS

"A wonderful enterprise, admirably planned, and deserving the highest success."—*The Nation*.

THE FIRST DOZEN VOLUMES

5. BOTANY: THE MODERN STUDY OF PLANTS.

By M. C. STOPES, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.L.S.

"A wonderful 'multum in parvo,' and cannot fail, by its lucidity and pleasant method of exposition, to give the reader not only a clear conception of the science of botany as a whole, but also a desire for fuller knowledge of plant life."—*Notes and Queries*.

10. HEREDITY. By J. A. S. WATSON, B.Sc.

"Accurate, and written in a simple manner which will stimulate those who are interested to wider reading."—*Athenæum*.

12. ORGANIC CHEMISTRY. By Professor J. B. COHEN, B.Sc., F.R.S.

"An excellently clear and efficient treatise on a subject not easily confined within a short or untechnical discourse."—*The Manchester Guardian*.

13. THE PRINCIPLES OF ELECTRICITY. By NORMAN R. CAMPBELL, M.A.

"As for Mr. Norman Campbell's treatise 'in petto' I cannot but think it a model of its kind. He takes next to nothing for granted."—*Sunday Times*.

15. THE SCIENCE OF THE STARS. By E. W. MAUNDER, F.R.A.S., of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich.

"Will convey to the attentive reader an enormous amount of information in a small space, being clear and abreast of current knowledge."—*The Athenæum*.

26. HENRI BERGSON: THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHANGE. By H. WILDON CARR.

"The fact that M. Bergson has read the proof-sheets of Mr. Carr's admirable survey will give it a certain authoritativeness for the general reader."—*Daily News*.

32. ROMAN CATHOLICISM. By H. B. COXON. Preface, Mgr. R. H. BENSON.

"This small book is one which cannot fail to be of use to those who desire to know what Catholics do, and do not, believe."—*The Catholic Chronicle*.

39. MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS. By E. O'NEILL, M.A.

"Mrs. O'Neill, on 'Mary Queen of Scots,' is splendid; it is an attempt to give the very truth about a subject on which all feel interest and most lie freely."—*Daily Express*.

47. WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE. By M. G. FAWCETT, LL.D.

"Mrs. Fawcett's admirably concise and fair-minded historical sketch of the women's suffrage movement. We could hardly ask for a better summary of events and prospects."—*Daily News*.

51. SHAKESPEARE. By Professor C. H. HERFORD, Litt.D.

"Well worth a place alongside Professor Raleigh's book in the 'English Men of Letters.' . . . Sets a high note and retains it without effort."—*Observer*.

53. PURE GOLD—A CHOICE OF LYRICS AND SONNETS. By H. C. O'NEILL.

"An anthology of good poetry such as we might expect from a man of taste."—*Daily News*.

57. DANTE. By A. G. FERRERS HOWELL.

"It is a fine piece of scholarship, and should be read by any one who is beginning the study of Dante, or indeed any one who is interested generally in the early process of European literature, for the process is here admirably analysed."—*The Manchester Guardian*.

THE SECOND DOZEN VOLUMES (Ready)

1. THE FOUNDATIONS OF SCIENCE. By W. C. D. WHETHAM, M.A., F.R.S.

11. INORGANIC CHEMISTRY. By Professor E. C. C. BALY, F.R.S.

14. RADIATION. By P. PHILLIPS, D.Sc.

22. LORD KELVIN. By A. RUSSELL, M.A., D.Sc., M.I.E.E.

23. HUXLEY. By Professor G. LEIGHTON, M.D.

36. THE GROWTH OF FREEDOM. By H. W. NEVINSON.

41. JULIUS CAESAR: SOLDIER, STATESMAN, EMPEROR. By HILARY HARDINGE.

43. ENGLAND IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By Mrs. E. O'NEILL, M.A.

54. FRANCIS BACON. By Professor A. R. SKEMP, M.A.

55. THE BRONTËS. By Miss FLORA MASSON.

60. A DICTIONARY OF SYNONYMS. By AUSTIN K. GRAY, B.A.

61. HOME RULE. By L. G. REDMOND HOWARD.

List of other Volumes in Preparation may be had.

LONDON AND EDINBURGH: T. C. & E. C. JACK

NEW YORK: DODGE PUBLISHING CO.



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

RECEIVED
MAIN LOAN DESK

MAR 1 1953

A.M.

2 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 5 6 P.M.

REC'D LD-URL
MAY 2 1963

MAY 1 1963

REC'D LD-URL
LD
URL
MAR 27 1972

APR 1 1972

REC'D LD-URL

MAR 28 1987
MAR 28 1987



3 1158 01175 3471



A 001 238 739 5

